

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



THE HISTORY
OF THE
COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN BY
BASIL POPOFF,
STUDENT OF THE S. PETERSBURG ECCLESIASTICAL ACADEMY.

EDITED BY
THE REV. J. M. NEALE, D.D.,
WARDEN OF SACKVILLE COLLEGE.

LONDON:
JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,
AND NEW BOND STREET.

MDCCLXI.

100. b. 137.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY JOSEPH MASTERS AND CO.,
ALDERSGATE STREET.



PREFACE.

THERE is, I believe, no Ecclesiastical history in the English language,—of a period common to the East and West,—which takes the Oriental view of the matter in question.

If it were only on this account, the present volume, relating the last attempt at an union between the two great Churches, would possess a certain value.

But, it is further to be observed, that several Russian manuscripts and printed works throw a light on the Council of Florence which is not afforded by any of its Western historians.

It was with great pleasure, therefore, that I acceded to the request of my friend, the Rev. Eugene Popoff, Chaplain to the Russian Embassy in London, to edit the following translation, the work of his son. Although the translator's manuscript needed very little correction, there was here and there a phrase which presented a foreign idiom; and some of the proper names were given after the Russ and not after the English fashion of orthography. Beyond this, I have not felt at liberty to make any alteration.

I would only observe that, with respect to what after all was the chief point debated at Florence, the *Filioque*

controversy, so far as regards the adoption of the new clause into the Creed, a most undoubted Anglican authority speaks thus: "Though the addition of words to the formal Creed, without the consent and against the protestation of the Oriental Church be not justifiable;" and again: "Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for adding *Filioque* to the Creed, contrary to the General Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of another Council: and so the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, *never to be ended until those words, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Πιῶ, or Filioque, are taken out of the Creed.*"¹

With respect to another Article debated at Florence, the Papal supremacy, the Anglican reader will perceive how entirely the Oriental arguments are those which we employ at the present day; while with regard to Azymes, it is rather by accident than from principle that we agree to the Eastern view.

The present volume was originally the work of a student in the Spiritual Academy at Moscow, but has received correction from, and I believe I may say the *imprimatur* of, the Theological Professor in the same Academy. If it assists in making the Eastern Church and the great learning of its scholars better known to ourselves, I shall be most thankful for the very small share I have taken in the publication of the present volume.

S. MATTHIAS, STOKE NEWINGTON,
Saturday of the Second Week in Advent,
 Dec. 14, 1861.

¹ Bishop Pearson, Vol. I. p. 492; Vol. II. p. 407.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE .	1

CHAPTER I.

VIEW OF THE STATE OF THE EASTERN EMPIRE AND THE CHURCH OF ROME PRECEDING THE FLORENTINE COUNCIL . .	8
--	---

CHAPTER II.

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE EMPERORS MANUEL AND JOHN PALÆOLOGH, THE SEE OF ROME, AND THE COUNCIL OF BASLE, REGARDING THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES . .	14
---	----

CHAPTER III.

DEPARTURE OF THE GREEKS FOR THE COUNCIL AND THEIR ARRIVAL IN FERRARA	31
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

OPENING OF THE COUNCIL IN FERRARA. PRIVATE DISPUTES ON PURGATORY	40
---	----

CHAPTER V.

THE SOLEMN SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL. DISPUTES ON THE LATIN ADDITION TO THE CREED	60
--	----

CHAPTER VI.

	PAGE
REMOVAL OF THE COUNCIL TO FLORENCE. DISPUTES ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST FROM THE SON . . .	85

CHAPTER VII.

SECRET MEANS FOR RECONCILING THE GREEKS TO THE LATIN DOCTRINE ON THE "FILIOQUE" CLAUSE	118
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

DISPUTES ON OTHER LATIN DOCTRINES. DEATH OF THE PATRI- ARCH. PROCLAMATION OF THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES .	142
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

RETURN OF THE GREEKS HOME. REJECTION OF THE FLOREN- TINE UNION BY THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH	164
--	-----

CHAPTER X.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE COUNCIL	184
---	-----

HISTORY

OF THE

COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

INTRODUCTION.

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

It was at an early period that the spirit of supremacy began to show itself in the Pontiffs of Rome. As soon as their unceasing and strenuous efforts to spread their spiritual monarchy over the whole of the West were crowned with success, they, not content with this, sought also the submission to their pontifical throne of their own equals—the Eastern Patriarchs, and thus occasioned that great division of the West and East, which, commencing under Photius, ended in the final schism of the Church of Rome from the only Orthodox Church of the East. It was not love of power alone that caused this division; but also an obstinacy in adhering to many material regressions from the ancient doctrine and discipline of the Church Œcumenical. Time, instead of abating this love of power and eradicating errors, only conduced to their development and

strength. Thus it was, that the division of the Churches became more and more permanent, while the Eastern Christians, true to their ancient Orthodoxy, were strengthened in their aversion to the Latin Church.

The calamitous state of the Eastern Empire, bereft of its strength, at one and the same time open to the ravages of barbarous and rude nations from the north and east, while it suffered no less from the encroachments of its own brethren of the West, more than once engendered a wish in its rulers to restore the former spirit of love and peace between the Churches, hoping by these means to find effectual aid in the head of Western Christianity against enemies threatening the Empire with ruin and desolation. The Popes were nothing loth to receive such demonstrations from the East, always keeping their own object in view, that of attaining supremacy and dominion over the four Eastern Patriarchates. Nevertheless, it was very evident, that as long as the Popes retained such an object in view, and refused to return to the pure ancient doctrine and practice of the Church, no such efforts of reconciliation would prove successful.

The fruit of these efforts during the existence of the Eastern Empire, was a Council, which, convened at Ferrara, was afterwards removed to Florence, and there came to a close. Twenty years of preparation for this Council, the presence of the Eastern Emperor, the Patriarch of Constantinople with other Patriarchal Vicars (*Ἐπίτροποι*) and Bishops, on one side, and that of the Pope, with his numerous suite of Cardinals and Bishops on the other; then, again, the long duration of the conferences on the principal causes of the division;

lastly, the very minuteness with which the points in dispute were brought under the notice of the Synod—all this together enhances the special value of a history of the Council. Whereas, again, its close, so contrary to the hopes and expectations nourished at its opening by those who came from the far east, contrary to the evident superiority of the last named in truth and justice, gives rise to a very laudable curiosity as to how affairs were really carried on in this assembly. A son of the Orthodox Græco-Russian Church has besides this a more special inducement to acquaint himself with the history of this Council, not only because it included among its members a Russian Metropolitan, who took no little interest in the acts, though himself no great defender of the ancient Orthodoxy of his Church; but also because the decrees of Florence served as a foundation for the so-called “Unia” organised in the south-eastern provinces of our country, thanks to the Jesuits of the sixteenth century. An impartial history will show how unjustly the canons of the Council of Florence were, and even are, counted as the production of Greeks, ever the true sons of their Orthodox Church.

The contemporary description of this Council by Syropulus, known by the name of a “Truthful History of an unjust union,” is the first and principal source for the History of this Council.¹ Sylvester Syropulus, a

¹ This title is given to Syropulus' work by the editor. The beginning of the History is lost, and thus its real title is unknown. When dividing his History, Syropulus calls his work *Ἀπομνημονεύματα*. Edit. Hagæ Comit. 1660, in folio. The Greek text has a Latin, though not a very correct version by Creighton.

Greek by birth, was the son of a Church-teacher,¹ by whom he was educated, and soon formed an intimate acquaintance with many pious and learned men of his time. Ordained deacon of the Constantinopolitan Church, with the title of Ecclesiarch and Dikeophylax, he accompanied the Patriarch to the Council of Florence, was present at it in the capacity of a member, and thus saw and heard all things transacted there, even taking part in many of the minor meetings of the Bishops; lastly, he was more than once sent by the other members of the Council to the Pope. His steadfastness in the Orthodox doctrine and aversion from the union drew on him the Emperor's anger, and was the cause of much indignation on the part of the Latins and the Greek apostates from Orthodoxy. At the urgent demands of the Emperor's officers, he signed the Council's decrees; but shortly afterwards sincerely repented of what he had done; and, withdrawing himself from the union and his Church office, wrote his history of the Synod.²

The history of Syropulus closes with the events of the years 1444 and 1445; we can, with great likelihood, suppose that it was written just about this time; and, consequently, during the lifetime of the Emperor, John Palæologus, and many other members of the Council. This circumstance attests the truth of his history. He himself affirms in many places, that there is nothing but truth in his history,³ that he even wished to omit

¹ Syrop. ix. 14. By the name of Church Teachers the Greeks understood those members of the Clergy whose principal occupation was preaching in the Church.

² This is seen from his own words.

³ Syr. xi. 4.

many things, but could not do so, as the witnesses of these events were still alive.¹ Without going into the details of the public disputes, written down during the very sittings of the Council, he relates the private conferences of the Greek Bishops, generally using their own expressions.² When describing the preliminary intercourse of the Emperor and Patriarch with the Popes, he makes use of the “γράμματα” entered into the Church codex;³ he also finds place in his history for some of the genuine acts of the Council, e.g., the opinions of the Patriarch and the Emperor on the Procession of the HOLY GHOST; also for the objections of the Latins against the exposition of the same doctrine made by the Greek Bishops.⁴ With rare honesty he refuses witnessing to subjects more or less unknown to him, but narrates what he himself had heard.⁵ Speaking of the principal authors of the union, he is far from concealing their good qualities, remarking that it is unjust to pass them over in silence;⁶ neither is he silent upon many injudicious acts of the defenders of Orthodoxy;⁷ he then relates, with great frankness and sincerity, how he was obliged to sign his name to the Council decree, and tries to exculpate himself, by saying, that it was not done for money.⁸ Lastly, we must say that the memoirs of Syropulus correspond in the principal points with other Greek and Latin narratives of the Council. All these circumstances attest

¹ Syr. iii. 1.² Syr. v. 5.³ Syr. ii. 8.⁴ Syr. ix. 9, 10. Compare Synod. Flor. pp. 610, 611. See also Syr. viii. 14, 17, 19.⁵ Syr. viii. 12, and in many other parts of his work.⁶ Syr. vi. 23, 24.⁷ Syr. ix. 6.⁸ Syr. x. 8.

the sincerity of the writer and the truth of his history.

We have already mentioned, that Syropulus does not give place in his history to any of the public disputes at the Council; but to make up for this he endeavours to disclose the object held in view by the Emperor, the Pope and their party, and the motives from which they acted at the Council. His description of the private, secret intercourse between the Latins and Greeks after the public sittings of the Council, brings to light many of their dark doings, which, were it not for Syropulus, would have remained until now unknown to us. Generally speaking, were it not for his memoirs, the description of this Council by other authors would hardly have proved satisfactory.

Out of all the annals of this Council, published by the Church of Rome, the best is very rightly reckoned to be,—the History of the Council of Florence, written in Greek by one of its members, Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Mitylene.¹ It principally consists in an exposition of the Council disputes, very likely composed with the help of notes, made at the very Council, and to which the historian now and then refers. On finishing the Acts of the Council, the author commences his own diary of the chief occupations of the Greek Bishops until the close of the Synod. The diary is short, because the writer, who was one of the most active parti-

¹ This history is published under the title of *S. Gener. Florentina Synodus*, in 4to., two books. The author's name is not mentioned. Allatius refers it to Theodorus Xanthopulus. But Bertram, in his *Abhandlung vom Dorotheo von Mitylena einem ungenannten Geschichtschreiber*, Halle, 1759, in 4to., has proved its author to be Dorotheus of Mitylene.

zans of the Church union, only finds place for such subjects as seemed most important for his object in view, and looks upon them besides in his own light. In the course of our history of the Florentine Council, we can, under the guidance of Syropulus, also avail ourselves of the memoirs of Dorotheus, endeavouring as far as possible to clear the truth from falsehood, and to amplify one narrative by the other.

The Russian annals and memoirs, on the voyage of the Metropolitan Isidore to the Council, may also be of use in showing several circumstances, touching the Russian Metropolitan, of which there is no mention made in Syropulus, or in the Latin descriptions of the Council.¹

A complete history of the Council of Florence must not only show the progress of the Council and its results; but also give an introductory sketch of the contemporary state of the Eastern Empire and the Church of Rome. By doing this it will serve to explain the reason of the strenuous efforts made by the Emperor and Pope to convene a Council and accomplish the union of Churches.

¹ "The narrative about the Eighth Council" is published in the *Sophian Vremennik* (Times)—Stroeff's edition, P. ii., p. 18: also in *Nicon's Chronicle*, P. v. See also "Voyage of Isidore to the Council of Florence," printed in Vol. vi. of the *Ancient Russian Library*, 2nd Edit. pp. 27—70. "Voyage of Simeon of Suzdal to Italy," in *Sacharoff's* edition of the "Foreign Travels of Russians." St. Petersburg, 1837. P. ii., pp. 87—112.

CHAPTER I.

VIEW OF THE STATE OF THE EASTERN EMPIRE AND THE CHURCH OF
ROME PRECEDING THE FLORENTINE COUNCIL.

Pitiable was the state of the Empire of Constantinople, when Manuel II. (1391) began those negotiations with the Pope, which resulted in the Council of Florence. At that time everything was in the hands of the Turks. Manuel himself, during the very lifetime of his father, was forced by Bajazet II. to join him in his expeditions. Manuel's father, by the Sultan's order, was compelled to raze to the ground the city fortifications then only in course of erection. Then came the demands from Bajazet, that a mosque should be erected, and a *cadi* appointed in the town for the Turks, demands coupled with threats of shutting up the inhabitants within the city walls, in case of a refusal. True to his threat, Bajazet commenced ravaging towns and villages in the suburbs of Constantinople, forcing the poor inhabitants to migrate into other places; at the same time his armies devastated the Peloponnesus and demolished towns on the coast of the Euxine. The armies of Islam stationed close to the town cut off the import of corn; hunger drove the inhabitants to despair. Such was the beginning of Manuel's reign! Six years afterwards, Manuel at the demand of Bajazet was obliged to divide his nearly powerless authority between himself and his nephew Andronicus, who proclaimed himself the Sultan's tributary—and personally to seek the aid of the monarchs

of Western Europe. During his absence Constantinople nearly fell a prey to the ambitious views of Bajazet. Luckily for the town the Sultan met with a dreadful rival in the person of Timour. His victories over the Sultan sustained for a time the Empire's existence and made Manuel once more master of his own throne. Mahomet I., son and successor of Bajazet, kept the peace with the Greek Emperor.

But what remained now to the Emperor from out of his at one time vast possessions? In Asia he was no longer master of a single province, of a solitary town. True, Mahomet did restore the ruins on the coast of the Black Sea, the Propontis and in Thessaly, but then these ruins alone, with Constantinople, were all that remained to him of the once great Empire. Even of this he was master only at the Sultan's grace. Such a state of affairs could not continue long. In the reign of Manuel's successor, John VI. Palæologus, the limits of the Empire were still less; the Emperor paid the Sultan Murad II. 100,000 aspres. In reality it was the latter who was unlimited master of the Empire, having the power even of levying troops from among the Greeks. The Turks pillaged towns, devastated whole provinces, and expelled the inhabitants. The Emperor could only witness the calamities of his subjects, but help them he could not. His army for the most part consisted of mercenaries, his fleet was insignificant, the finances of the Empire were in the greatest disorder, so that at last John was brought to the necessity of selling Thessalonica to the Venetians, in order to pay the expenses of his court.

The Empire was evidently on the brink of ruin, and

well aware of this were the poor owners of Constantinople. They knew besides, that as long as the town remained in Greek hands, they might still find some help on the part of the Western Monarchs, and hope for some success over the Turks. But it was just as evident to them, that as long as the division of the Churches continued, the Western Christians would sooner stand by, and allow the Turks to annihilate all the East, than offer a helping hand in its defence. This then was the reason why Manuel, in hopes of saving his Empire, determined on entering into negotiations with the Pope, which were carried on by John with the view of attaining an union of Churches by means of an Œcumenical Council. They were in hopes, that such a Council could, on the authority of Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition, solve all the points of dissension between the Churches; the East and West would make peace with each other on the subject of faith, and that then all Christian nations, the cause of their religious enmity being done away with, would give their hands and hearts to the defence of the faithful against the infidels.

It was no secret, that the hope of receiving help for the Empire by means of a Council, was the real motive both the Emperors had in proposing this union to the Pope. Even the Turks guessed the designs of the Emperors and dreaded the alliance.¹ The Emperor, John Palæologus, himself more than once told his spiritual and civil nobles, at Constantinople, then at Ferrara, and Florence, that this was the very object of the assembling of the Council.

¹ See the last advice given by Manuel to his son, in the *Hist.* iii. 13. Edit. Bonn, p. 178.

We will now turn our attention to the contemporary state of ecclesiastical affairs in the West. It will then be plain, why the Pope evinced so sincere a readiness to take on himself the assembling of the Council, for the union of Churches.

Since the removal of the Papal seat to Avignon (1308), the Western Church was disturbed by many violent commotions, which led to the so-called "great schism." (1378—1428.) During half a century the Church of the West was divided between two Popes, of whom one remained in Italy, and the other resided in France. The Popes and anti-Popes by levelling anathemas at each other caused great disturbances among the clergy and laity: the people and their rulers were quite at a loss, whom to receive as the lawful rulers of the Church; the party of one Pope persecuted the party of the other, and both used the most unlawful means for augmenting their incomes. It was during these universal commotions, that the monarchs and the clergy of the West became persuaded in the necessity of a reform in this Church, beginning with her head and ending in her members, fully conscious at the same time, that this reform must be made by means of an Œcumenical Council, and not by the Popes themselves. Thus, the Western Church by a series of calamities returned to the old persuasion, however opposed it might have been to that of the Popes, that the only visible, universal authority, must be, without exception, that of the Œcumenical Councils. So that at the beginning of the fifteenth century Councils were convened in the West, which claiming to themselves the title of Œcumenical also claimed the right of judging the Popes, and with unequal success set about re-

forming the many abuses caused in the Church by Papal avarice and ambition.

The refusal (contrary to their own promise, and the requests of the Emperors and Bishops) of Gregory XII. chosen Pope by the Italian Cardinals, and of Pope Benedict XII. then at Avignon, to surrender their claims to the Papal chair, was followed by the Council of Pisa, which being convened against them, transferred the Papal tiara to Alexander V., branding them with the name of schismatics, heretics, and perjurers. But this election, far from quieting the disturbances in the Church, only served to augment her calamities by the addition of a new Pope. On the death of Alexander, John XXIII. continued anathematizing his rivals—Gregory and Benedict. At last the Council of Constance wishing (1414) to put an end to all disturbances, solemnly proclaimed that “this Œcumenical Council has received immediate authority from our LORD JESUS CHRIST; and every member of the Church, not excepting the Pope, must obey the Council in all matters pertaining to faith, the putting down of schism and ecclesiastical reform. If, contrary to this canon, the Pope or any one else refuses to receive this, or any other Œcumenical Council, he shall be sentenced to penance, and when necessary be even visited with legal punishment.” This decree was enforced on John XXIII.; he was sentenced to be deprived of the Papal chair. He was succeeded by Otho Colonna, who took the name of Martin V. (Nov. 11, 1417). The Council next betook itself to the reform of the Church, though in reality it limited itself to a very few changes, as the Pope would not allow any serious alterations to be made, managing to postpone

the settling of the general demands from one Council to another. Thus in the lifetime of the same Pope Martin, the Council of Constance was successively followed by that of Pavia, (1423), Sienna, (1424), with no better success, and lastly, by that of Basle (1431), which was so much dreaded by Martin's successor, Eugenius IV.

It was at this very period of time, when the Papal authority had received so severe a check from the schism, when the former conviction of the infallibility and absolute power of the Pope had lost its force and made way for the opinion, that the authority of Œcumenical Councils was greater than that of the Pope; then it was, that the Popes, fearful of entirely losing their power over the Church, and unable to contend with the prevalent spirit of reform, joyfully acceded to the Emperor's proposal of the union of Churches, the more readily as this union seemed very likely to be of service in sustaining their now tottering power. They might well expect to become the Supreme rulers of the whole Christian world, and then to be able to destroy with ease all the reformers of the West, as soon as the union of Churches should be attained at an Œcumenical Council.

Thus the Council, at which it was purposed to bring about the union of Churches, offered great advantages both to the Emperor and the Pope.

CHAPTER II.

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE EMPERORS MANUEL AND JOHN PALÆOLOGUS WITH THE POPES OF ROME AND THE COUNCIL OF BASLE, REGARDING THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES.

The negotiations between Constantinople and Rome concerning the union of Churches began in the lifetime of the Emperor, Manuel Palæologus.¹ Pope Martin V., influenced by the Greek legate Eudæmon, had most graciously accepted the Emperor's proposal, and sent letters to him and the patriarch Joseph, elected patriarch from Metropolitan of Ephesus (1416). The Constantinopolitans found tokens of the Pope's disposition to peace in the fact that he styled the Patriarch brother; that he gave his consent to the marriage of two princesses of the Roman faith, with John and Theodore the Emperor's sons; and lastly, that he sent indulgences for those about to defend the newly erected fortifications in Morea. The Emperor and the Patriarch returned thanks to the Pope for his interest in the proposed union of Churches, noticing at the same time, that in their opinion an Œcumenical Council offered the only means of restoring peace to the Church. This Council, said they, free from external influence, and avoiding unnecessary disputes, could well investigate the causes of disagreement between the

¹ These negotiations date as early as the year 1415. Manuel sent his legate to Italy from Morea where he was superintending the erection of a fortification (ἑξαμίλιον, a wall of six miles length). Synod. Flor. tom. i. p. 551. Eudæmon was present at the election of Martin to the Papal chair. Syr. ii. 5.

Churches, and as soon as its decision, founded on the doctrine taught by the ancient Fathers of the Church, should be sincerely and unanimously received, then could the union take place.¹ To this the Emperor subjoined a petition for aid against the Turks. Martin published a bull, inviting all European monarchs to join in the extirpation of the Turks, at the same time ordering his Bishops to preach a crusade against them, (July 10, 1420); appointed the Cardinal of S. Angelo his legate in Constantinople, with instructions to treat about the peace, and then in order to meet the expenses of the proposed Council demanded pecuniary aid from the Archbishops of Cologne, Mayence, and Treves.²

On receiving from Constantinople the sudden news, that the Turks had made several movements hindering the convocation of a Council, the Pope delayed his projected plans, and sent his nuncio, Antonio Massana, to make some preliminary arrangements as to the place and time of the Council, and the conditions under which the union might take place. The Emperor received the nuncio very graciously (Sept. 16, 1422), and had already named the day for treating on the conditions, when of a sudden he was taken to his bed, struck by a fit of apoplexy, and was thus obliged to entrust all State affairs to his son *John*.

After much delay, Antonio managed at length to lay the Papal demands first before the Emperor, and then before the Patriarch, in the presence of the other Bishops. The nuncio declared, that the Pope heartily

¹ Syrop. ii. 8.

² Fleury, Hist. Eccles. ci. 51. The Pope required 6000 florins from each Archbishop. cii. 7.

wished for the union, demanding only that the Emperor should, according to his promise, receive the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and obey it; that the Pope is agreeable to a convocation of a Council, but wishes to know when and where it will be convened.¹ In answer to this unexpected demand, a letter was sent from Constantinople, stating, that the Emperor gave no unconditional consent to the union, but only promised to convene a Council like unto the seven Œcumenical Councils, and assent to all the decisions of the Fathers, made by them under the inspiration of the HOLY GHOST. The Emperor fixed upon Constantinople for the Council, but could not determine the time of its session, as the town was then threatened by the Turks. In the end of his letter, the Emperor on his part demanded that the Pope should oblige all the Christian monarchs of Europe to declare war against the unbelievers.²

The Pope laid the Emperor's answer before the Council convened first at Pavia, and then removed to Sienna, for settling the affairs of the Western Church. But as this same Council was soon after broken up by Martin, who feared its decision might prove unfavourable to him, the project of union remained without any results at all.³

In the meantime, John, who looked upon the union as the only means for bettering the condition of his

¹ Syr. ii. 10, 11; Fleury, cii. 6, 7; Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccl.*

² Fleury, cii. 8; Dupin, tom. xii. p. 28, 29; Syr. ii. 10. The answer was sent Nov. 14, 1442. From the 10th of July till the 6th of September Constantinople was besieged by Murad. Peace with him was concluded February, 1424. Phranza, i. 39, 40.

³ Fleury, cii. 12, 13; Dupin, tom. xii. p. 29.

empire, made his way to Sigismund, Emperor of Germany, and tried his utmost to incline him to a war against the Turks. Sigismund, who was then himself warring with the Hussites, simply advised John to bring on the union as soon as possible.¹

Acting upon this advice, and true to the promise given to the Pope, through the nuncio, John, on his return from Hungary, renewed his negotiations with Rome concerning the Council; but this time the legates found their former proposition of assembling the Council at Constantinople strenuously opposed by the Pope. The Cardinals, with strange assurance, told them, that "the Church of Rome is the mother, the Eastern Church the daughter; it is not usual for the mother to go to the daughter, but the daughter to go to the mother;" and then demanded the convocation of the Council in Italy. To keep his part of the compact, the Pope promised to send ships and an army to defend the town of Constantinople, and pay the Greeks 100,000 florins to cover the expenses of their journey to the Council, and living during its session.² The Greek legates refused to accede to such a proposal without the Emperor's consent. To give more force to his demand,

¹ Syr. ii. 12. Just in this part of Syropulus's history there are several pages missing. Nevertheless, lower down, Syropulus mentions the results of the Emperor's interview with Sigismund (ii. 34, and iii. 13):—"If you complete the union of the Churches," said Sigismund, "then you will conduce to the reform of the Latin Church. The Christians of the East have more order than we have, for our people have in many things diverged from the old order of matters." John's voyage took up the time between the 15th of November, 1423, and October, 1424.

² Syr. ii. 12, 13.

the Pope sent back with them his own legate Andrew, Archbishop of Colossus,¹ who, born a Greek, had afterwards joined the Church of Rome. At first the Emperor apparently consented to go to Italy; but after asking the Patriarch's advice, he retracted his words, and dismissed the Papal legate without any answer, at the same time sending his general, Tagaris, and Macarius, the Protosyncellus, with a note to the Pope, the contents of which, Syropulus writes, as well as the Pope's answer to it, are unknown to us.¹

Day by day the relations of the empire to the Sultan were becoming more and more embarrassing. In April, 1430, he took Thessalonica by force of arms; in October Joannina was also his conquest. Harassed on all sides, the Emperor was brought to the necessity of acceding to the Papal demands. He forthwith sent an embassy to Rome, with his consent to Martin's proposal.

The Patriarch, though in public he agreed to the Emperor's wish, and obediently to his will asked the Pope's consent and aid to the union of Churches, nevertheless, in private, when in company with the more intimate of his Clergy, told them that he would on no account go to the Council in Italy. "To be paid by the Pope," said he, "means, to recognise his authority over myself. And how shall a hireling slave refuse obedience to his master? Think, also, what state shall we be in, if, once in a strange land, we meet with a refusal to pay our expenses, and give us the means of returning home!

¹ [I.e., of Rhodes.]

² Syr. ii. 14, 15. They returned from the Pope in August, 1430. Phranza, ii. 9.

And why not convoke a Council here in Constantinople? Those who come here from the West will be in no need of our help. If even 100,000 aspres were required, they might easily be collected from the Bishops. The Russian Metropolitan alone will bring as much to the Emperor, who can well spare 20,000 out of it; as much can be obtained from the Archbishops of Georgia and Servia; the Eastern Patriarchs can give 2,000, or at least 1,000 florins; our rich folk will readily give 1,000 each, some 600, others 300 and 100 aspres." So thought the Patriarch; but the Emperor had other plans.

The legates came to Rome only in time to be present at Martin's death-bed, (Feb. 20, 1431.) He was succeeded by Eugenius IV., (March 3, 1431.) In his letter to the Emperor and Patriarch, the new Pope agreed to assemble a Council in Italy, but evinced no great energy in its cause. The Greeks were very much offended with several of his expressions, and rather troubled with some demands not mentioned to them by Martin.¹ Eugenius was also put into a very perplexing position, as the sums collected by Martin for the assembling of the Council had been embezzled by his relations, so that Eugenius was obliged to enter into open war with them.²

But very soon the Council of Basle made the Pope more attentive to the scheme of the union of Churches, and induced him to lay aside his pride and arrogance while in intercourse with the Emperors of the East.

Eugenius, soon after the opening of the Council of

¹ Syr. ii. 19, 20.

² Fleury, cii. 33, 34.

Basle, (July 23, 1431,) noticed that the Council intended to act in the same spirit of independence from the Pope, as its predecessor the Council of Constance. This determined him to close the Council, (Dec. 18, 1431,) and fix upon another one at Bologna, to be held in a year and a half's time, under plea that the Greeks had promised to come to Italy for the union. But the Council of Basle, backed by the Emperor Sigismund's authority and the interest of all the German princes, and France, gave the Pope a very decisive answer, stating, that the Council does not intend changing its place of convocation, or finishing its business in hand, but rather means to set itself to the extirpation of heresies, the amelioration of morals, and restoration of peace; and hopes at the same time that Pope Eugenius will favour the Council opened under his own auspices and those of his predecessor. At the same time, the Council confirmed the Constance decree respecting the submission of every person, the Pope included, to the authority of the Council; demanded the Pope's appearance at it; threatening, in case of his refusal, to judge him according to the laws of the Church. The Pope, at one time fearing decisive steps on the part of the Council, at another oppressed by his discontented subjects, who compelled him to fly from Rome, was obliged to accede to the demands of the Fathers of Basle (Dec. 15, 1433), and sent his plenipotentiaries to sit at the Council.

During these disputes the Council had, of its own accord, opened negotiations with the Greek Emperor; for Andrew, Archbishop of Colossus, sent by the Pope to negotiate with the Council, had persuaded its mem-

bers that the Greeks sincerely desired the union of Churches.¹

Having sent Anthony, a Bishop, and Albertus, a Doctor, to Constantinople, the Council invited the Greeks to join, bringing forward, as an inducement to them, the superiority of the Council's authority to that of the Pope, and its better ableness to bring about the union; showing also that many kings, and even the Emperor Sigismund, sided with it, and that therefore there were more hopes of aid for the Greeks from the Council than from the Pope, whose glory was fast ebbing away.²

The Emperor John, notwithstanding he had already begun negotiating with Eugenius, assented to the advantageous proposals of the Council and sent his ambassadors to Basle with letters from himself and the Patriarch, authorising them to agree to anything decided upon by the Council, with their consent, and conducive to the peace of the Churches. Among these ambassadors was Isidore, hegumen of the monastery of S. Demetrius, and afterwards Metropolitan of Russia.³

¹ Mentioning his former negotiations with the Greeks in Pope Martin's time, Andrew remarks: "*Nec audita vobis, Patres, pronuncio, sed quæ vidi et quæ præcepta ejusdem præsulis (P. Martini) ipse contrectavi et publica stipulatione concluseram.*" Of John Palæologus' last mission to Eugenius he says: "*Legati Græcorum Pontificem adierunt et coram Romanorum Rege, domino Sigismundo, pro unionis negotio Imperator et Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus voluntatem et vota triginta sex articulis patefecerant. Scio quod verum loquor et quod hæ manus litteras -obsignatas explicuerint et quæ illic continebantur, ex Græcis Latina feceram.*" This speech was made by Andrew at the Council, August 22, 1432. *Binii Concil. t. viii. p. 234.*

² *Syr. ii. 21.*

³ The letters of the Patriarch and the Emperor (dated Oct. 15, 1433) are found in the Acts of the Council of Basle, *Binii Concil. t. viii. pp. 57*

Eugenius, on learning of the Emperor's embassy to the Council, contrary to his former plan, informed the Emperor of his readiness to convene a Council in Constantinople. One can explain such a change in Eugenius's tactics by supposing that he could not part with his idea of breaking up the Council, notwithstanding he was then at peace with it. The present circumstances seemed very opportune for his plans.¹ Unaware what success his negotiations with the Council of Basle would meet with, the Emperor consented to the Pope's proposal, informing the Council of such a step on his part.

In the meantime the Emperor's ambassadors at Basle, after a long deliberation with the Council deputies, entered into a treaty with them, (Sept. 17, 1434.) They declared, that (1) if the Council for the union of Churches is to be convoked at Constantinople, all the expenses connected with it will be paid by the Emperor; in the contrary case, the Western Church must aid the Greeks. (2.) The Council may be convoked, besides Constantinople, in Calabria, in Milan, or Ancona, or in any other seaport town; in Bologna, or some other Italian town; out of Italy, in Vienna, Buda, or in Savoy. (3.) The ambassadors promised that the Emperor, Patriarch, and other necessary persons would come to the Council. On hearing these conditions, the Council agreed to take upon itself the expenses necessary for

and 297. The Greek great stratopedarch, Demetrius Palæologus, and John Dis-hypatus, were also in the mission, together with Isidore.

¹ Syr. ii. 22. Bini Concil. t. viii. p. 300. The Pope also wrote to the King of Trebizond, as is evident from the King's answer to the Pope (Oct. 18, 1434); also to Boleslaus, the Grand Duke of Livonia. A separate letter was written by the Pope to Gregory, Metropolitan of Moldovlachia. Le Quien. Or. Christ. t. i. p. 1252.

the maintenance and journey from Constantinople and back of the Emperor and Bishops ; promised to send a fleet and army to defend Constantinople in the absence of the Emperor ; showed readiness to convene the Council in any of the above-mentioned places except Constantinople itself ; and lastly, promised the Pope's consent to all these conditions.¹ To have this treaty ratified by the Emperor, three members of the Clergy were sent to Constantinople—John of Ragusa, Henry Manger, and Simon Freyron, who brought the Greeks 8,000 florins to prepare with for the journey.²

Christopher, the Papal legate, arrived at the same time as the ambassadors of Basle ; for the Council, on coming to know of the agreement made between the Pope and the Emperor, had represented to the Pope how contrary to the honour of the Emperor, Pope, and Council it was to break treaties solemnly made ; how great a danger threatened Constantinople, surrounded as it was by the Turks. Eugenius, though in his epistle to the Council of Basle (Feb. 22, 1435) he insisted on the opening of the Council in Constantinople,³ had sent off his own plenipotentiary with the legates from Basle, who was ordered to confirm all the decisions made by the Council ; but in reality secret instructions were given him by the Pope, to hinder the Council as much as possible, to disconcert its relations to the Greeks, and principally to work upon the aged Patriarch, who of all was the most inclined for the assembling of the Council in Constantinople.

¹ Binii t. viii. p. 55, et seq.

² Syr. ii. 23, 24.

³ Weissenberg. Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen xv. und xvi. Jahrh. 2 Band, S. 363, 364.

On coming to the Emperor's presence, the ambassadors of Basle endeavoured to persuade him to convene the Council in Basle instead of any of the other places mentioned.¹ The Emperor inclined to their proposal. But before giving his full consent, he formed a committee of clergy and laymen to look over the treaty, or rather the decree of the Council of Basle.²

In the very beginning of the decree, amongst many other strange expressions, there was one as follows: "The Fathers are assembled at the Œcumenical Council (of Basle) to extirpate the newly risen heresy of the Bohemians (Hussites) and the ancient heresy of the Greeks."³ Great was the astonishment of the Orthodox on reading these words, insulting to all the Church, and instantly it was demanded, that these words should either be omitted or corrected. The ambassadors pleaded as an excuse, that the words so offensive to the Greeks were owing to the fault of the writer of the decree, and even tried to put all the blame on the Greeks themselves, as they had heard the decree read at the Council, and might then have demanded the correction of expressions unpleasant to them. At last it was decided to make a new preface to the decree, and send it over to Basle to receive the Council seal. The other parts

¹ See speeches of the Basle legates in the Acts of the Council. Binius t. viii. p. 220—222, and Syr. ii. 23.

² Syr. ii. 25—27.

³ This is written in the decree thus: "Hujus S. Synodi ab initio sue congregationis præcipua cura fuit, recens illud Bohemorum antiquumque Græcorum dissidium prorsus extinguere." Very likely *dissidium* in the Greek translation of the decree was rendered *αἵρεσις*. At all events, the comparison of the Greeks with the Hussites, in point of heresy, was justly a matter of offence to all the Orthodox.

of the treaty were received without a word. As to the place for the Council, that was to be fixed upon as soon as the Greeks should be ready to start.¹

The ratification of all these things by the Pope's legate was the next thing demanded. After many vain efforts to avoid a decisive answer, the legate told the Greeks, that he had the Pope's authority to ratify, and did ratify all arrangements made until that time, and as a proof of his words showed the Council the Papal decree, which indeed authorized him to act as he did.

Thus the decree was copied and sent to Basle with the letters from the Emperor, his brother Constantine, and the Patriarch (Nov. 1435), containing besides the former conditions, a new demand of the Pope's personal appearance at the Council, as the Head of the Latin Church and the West.²

The following year the revised decree was sent from Basle with the Council seal.³ The Emperor began to assemble the Bishops. Legates with letters and presents were sent into different provinces of the Eastern Church. The holy Fathers began to assemble in Constantinople. Georgia sent two Bishops and a royal minister; Trebizond sent a Metropolitan and a legate; the Metropolitan of Moldovlachia also arrived with his suite. Isidore, a short time before this ordained Me-

¹ Syr. ii. 28, 30, 32, 35. Syropulus' words are attested by the extant acts of the Council: 1. *Articuli Imperatoris Constantinopolitani*; 2. *Articuli responsorii Ambassadorum Concilii*; 3. *Promissiones factæ per Ambassadors S. Concilii*. Binius, *Concil. t. viii. p. 219, 223*.

² Letters joined to the Acts. Binius *t. viii. p. 301, 302*.

³ This decree is found in the Acts of the Council of Basle, twenty-fourth session. *Bin. Conc. t. viii. p. 68*.

tropolitan of Russia, was ordered on his departure for Moscow to arrange affairs, so as for Russia also to take part in the union of Churches, and to bring Russian legates and Bishops back with him to Constantinople. An embassy was also sent to the despot of Servia, but neither letter, nor legate was ever received from him. The envoys sent to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, brought back letters from them, in which the Patriarchs, though refusing to appear personally at the Council, at the same time named their representatives.¹ The Alexandrian Patriarch chose Antony Metropolitan of Heraclea, and Marcus Eugenicus, then as yet a plain monk; the Patriarch of Antioch chose Joasaph of Ephesus, and the Emperor's confessor, Gregory; the Patriarch of Jerusalem named Dionysius of Sardis, and the Russian Metropolitan Isidore. All these appointments were made under the direction of the envoy, conformably with the Emperor's wish, and even without any preliminary consent of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

In the *γράμματα* given to the Patriarchal vicars (*ἐπιτροποι*) the Patriarchs authorized them to give their consent only to such things as were conformable with the rules of the Councils and the writings of the fathers. Such conditions were anything but agreeable to John the envoy from Basle, and the Emperor; they were found to be too mean for the patriarchal vicars, as limiting too much their liberty of action. The Emperor demanded, that the Patriarchs should send out new *γράμματα*, writing them in a form already sent to

¹ Syr. iii. 2. Before leaving for the Council, Mark, Bessarion, and Dionysius, were raised to the rank of Metropolitans.

them. The demand was complied with, and besides this, the Patriarchs changed some of the appointments.¹

Having dismissed the envoys to the Eastern Fathers, the Emperor informed the Pope of his readiness to start for the Council with the Patriarch and clergy. Another envoy was despatched to the Fathers of Basle with a demand, that the promised galleys should be sent to Constantinople by the autumn.

In the mean time the Emperor assembled a council of the most illustrious nobles out of the clergy and laity, well known for their learning, and bade them enter into some preliminary discussions about the approaching dispute with the Latins. *Cantacuzene*, one of the highest nobles in the empire, and a strict upholder of Orthodoxy, said, that the first subject for the Council ought to be the addition to the symbol of faith, as one of the principal points in dispute between the Churches. *Georgius Scholarius*, the most learned man of his time, gave his advice, remarking, that, in order to reconcile the Churches, the Council must carefully investigate the disputed doctrine, and confirm it with the clear and incontrovertible words of the Church Teachers. Should the Emperor seek the union from political views, then there is no need of troubling many persons; two or three envoys alone could very well end the affair. The Emperor himself was far from wishing the Greeks to give way to the Latins without any dispute. For this reason it was determined to look over the works of the former defenders of Orthodoxy, written during their disputes with the Latins, and especially the works

¹ Syr. iii. 3, 4.

of Nilus Cavasilas.¹ It was also intended to send to Mount Athos for some of the old books, but these were never received.² Lastly, came the discussion as to the persons fit to be sent to the Council, among whom was one Nilus Tarchaniotes; but the Emperor fearing that Nilus, being a monk, would be too firm in his opinions, and thus spoil the whole affair, would not agree to send him.³

In the meantime great disturbances were going on at Basle between the members of the Council, who could not agree as to where the Synod should be assembled, and found the proposed sum insufficient for paying the Greeks the expenses of their voyage and stay. A final rupture between them and the Pope was the result. The greater part of the Council resolved to hold a Council at Basle, and in case of the Greeks disagreeing to this, —at Avignon or some city in Savoy; to cover expenses, —indulgences were liberally promised to those who would materially aid the holy cause of the union, and a tithe was to be collected from the Western Clergy. Nevertheless the ambassador who arrived from Constantinople with the news of the Greeks' readiness to start for the Council (Feb. 7, 1437) opposed the plan of assembling the Council either at Basle or at Avignon,

¹ Nilus Cavasilas, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, lived in the first half of the fourteenth century. He left many works written against the Latin Church, namely: 1. On the Causes of Dissension in the Church: 2. On the Papal Supremacy (both these works are published in Greek): 3. Several books containing a refutation of the Latin doctrine on the HOLY GHOST. The first two works, and some of the last, are met with in Slavonian manuscripts of ancient translation.

² Only two monks arrived from Mount Athos as deputies to the Council.

³ Syr. iii. 5—7.

as these towns were not named in the Emperor's treaty with the Council; he would not even agree to any town in Savoy for the Council, though that was named in the treaty, under the plea, that the Greeks applied this name not to the province itself, but to the towns belonging to the Duke of Savoy in Italy. The Pope also, ever aiming at the dissolution of the Council of Basle, sent his Legate there announcing his disapproval both of the places named for the Council session, and of the means for collecting money for the Greeks. On the 7th of May, 1437, ballot was resorted to, in order to put an end to all dissension, two-thirds of the members voting for the former towns, and the rest for Florence or Udino. Both parties wrote down their votes, which were read in the Cathedral, and the Council seal was then affixed to the decision carried by the majority of votes. It was then that the weaker party had recourse to a very uncreditable action: in the night the Council seal was carried off and affixed to their own decision. The Pope, availing himself of all these disturbances, ratified the decision of the weaker party, favourable to his own views (29th June), though afterwards he changed his mind and fixed upon Ferrara for the Council. Meanwhile the discontented members leaving Basle sided with the Pope. Among them was Julian Cæsarini, who, in after time, played a prominent part in the acts of the Ferraro-Florentine Council.¹

In order to anticipate the arrangements of the Council of Basle, the Pope sent off some galleys with a legate to Constantinople, and three Bishops inviting the Emperor and Greek Bishops to a Council in Italy. The Emperor's arrival in Italy was an event of great impor-

¹ Dupin, xii. pp. 37, 38.

tance to the Pope. As the Council of Basle had promised that the Pope should, as a matter of course, take part in the union of Churches, and Eugenius himself would have nothing to do with the Council, it became very evident that the Council would soon pass its judgment against him, and elect another Pope.

The legate declared that the Pope had made peace with the fathers of the Council; that the Council was dissolved, and another was to be convened in Italy.¹ At the same time, a learned Greek, George of Trebizond, who then lived in the West and was a son of the Latin Church, wrote to the Emperor, and assured him that during the distorted condition of the Western Church—during the contests between the Pope and the Council—the appearance of the Emperor in Italy on the Pope's side would of itself alone terminate all disputes.²

The Emperor had already given orders for all appointed to attend the Council—to get ready for the voyage. But twenty days had scarcely elapsed since the arrival of the Papal ships, when suddenly the galleys promised by the Council of Basle entered the Bosphorus. The rivals would have engaged each other in a naval fight, if the Emperor had not restrained them. The Papal legates and those of Basle spared neither efforts nor money to press the Greeks to their separate views. But soon the real state of Western affairs became evident to the Greeks, and made them still more puzzled which party to join. The legates of Basle declared that

¹ Syr. iii. 8, 9. The legate arrived with the galleys in the end of September, 1437.

² This letter is affixed to the History of George Phranza. Ingolstadt, 1604; pp. 325—331.

peace had been, and was at the time impossible between the Council and the Pope. One of them, a long resident in Constantinople, advised the Patriarch, as a friend, not to go either to Basle or to Italy. Many of the Bishops inclined the Emperor to the same step. Even Sigismund sent a courier to Constantinople, persuading the Emperor to delay the union of Churches for a time, until the internal dissensions in the Western Church came to an end. Lastly, Sultan Murad counselled the Emperor to rely more on the stability of an alliance with him than with the Latins. But, notwithstanding all these counsels and advices, the Emperor, rejecting the proposals of the Council of Basle, determined to sail for Italy in the galleys of Rome.¹

CHAPTER III.

DEPARTURE OF THE GREEKS FOR THE COUNCIL AND THEIR ARRIVAL IN FERRARA.

As soon as the voyage to Italy was decided upon, the Patriarch chose the Bishops who were to accompany him to the Council. They were twenty-two in number, including those sent from Trebizond, Georgia, and Moldavia, viz. :—Mark, Metropolitan of Ephesus; Dorotheus of Trebizond; Antony of Heraclea; Metrophanes of Cyzicus; Bessarion of Nicæa; Macarius of Nicomedia; Dionysius of Sardis; and the Metropolitans of Ternovo, Monemvasia, Lacedæmon, Amasia, Mitylene, Staupropolis, Moldovlachia, Rhodes, Melenicus, Drama,

¹ Syr. iii. 11—14.

Joannina, Silistria, Anchialus, and Georgia, with one Bishop.¹ At the same time the Patriarchal γράμματα were given to the Vicars, in whose election some changes were made. The Metropolitan of Heraclea was appointed Vicar of the Patriarchate of Alexandria; the Emperor's Chaplain, Gregory, with the Russian Metropolitan, of the Patriarchate of Antioch; the Metropolitan of Ephesus and Sardis of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem.²

First in learning, firmness of character, and orthodoxy among the Greek Bishops, was *Mark*, Metropolitan of Ephesus. A native of Constantinople, he, in his youth, received an education suitable to his age, and especially gave himself up to theological studies and the practice of eloquence. He was Principal of the Constantinopolitan school,³ and acquired so great a reputation for his sermons, that many persons from other provinces often asked him to write a sermon for such and such a festival.⁴ Belonging to the κλήρος of the great Constantinopolitan Church, he chose to seclude himself from the world and entered the Monastery of Mangana. Here, in a lonely cell, invisible even to his relations, he made the study of the Holy Scriptures and the Works of the Fathers the exclusive and favourite study of his mind and heart.⁵ This was how Mark

¹ Syr. iii. 15.

² Syr. iii. 20.

³ Gregor. protosyncel. Apologia in Marci confessionem ap. Allat. de Cons. Eccl. p. 934.

⁴ Ejusdem responsio ad epist. Marci in Synod. Flor. t. 11, p. 455.

⁵ The information respecting the life of Mark of Ephesus is found in the work of Manuel the Rhetorician (1590) under the name of Λόγος περὶ Μάρκου τοῦ Μητροπολίτου Ἐφέσου καὶ τῆς ἐν Φλωρεντίας συνόδου. MS. of the Moscow Synod. Library in Matthiæ's catalogue, No. 393, p. 112.

came to acquire a thorough knowledge of the principles of the Orthodox Faith. His clear, disciplined mind quickly saw the errors of the enemies of Orthodoxy, and found a ready apology for the truth; his deep religious feeling sustained him in the contest, and he would sooner die than turn traitor to the truth.

Bessarion, like Mark, was also one of the most learned men of his time. Well versed in theological science, he at the same time evinced such facilities of speech, that even the Greeks avowed his superiority in this respect over their favourite, Mark.¹ Besides these qualities, he had acquired renown among his contemporaries for being a subtle philosopher and warm defender of Plato. He was the favourite of the Emperor John Palæologus, who sought his advice on nearly everything, when about to depart for the Council.² But failings he had also: that firmness of character, that pure and incorruptible love of the truth, that soundness in the development of ideas,—traits so characteristic in Mark,—were not to be found in Bessarion. His egotism was likely to make him very soon break his friendship with one who was evidently becoming his rival.³ This is why Bessarion could never be a trusty coadjutor of Mark, in a cause to join which he was called upon by the Emperor.

¹ Syr. v. 5. The Emperor, on reading the two answers to the Latins, written one by Mark and the other by Bessarion, gave the former preference for the strength of his arguments, and found more oratorical art in the latter. Syr. v. 14.

² See testimony of Amirutius, who, with other learned Greeks, was present at the Council, contained in his letter to Prince Demetrius. Allat. de cons. Eccles. p. 884.

³ Syr. v. 16.

Joseph, the Patriarch of Constantinople, whose high rank made him an influential person in the Council, proved by his administration that he was hardly equal to his office in the Church and the circumstances of the time. Old, weak, and undecided, he allowed himself to be influenced by the laity in nearly every step he took, and, as a matter of course, could not successfully defend the Orthodox party of the Council against the attacks of a strong opposition. At times, it is true, he showed a sincere desire of guarding Orthodoxy from her enemies; but sound faculties and firmness of character were wanting in him, to enable him to enter into an open contest with these enemies. While nourishing hopes of success and glory among his posterity, he had always a ready answer in case of unsuccess: "If even," he used to say, "the Latins force us to something, we will always keep to the sound doctrine of the Fathers. Let them threaten us with tortures; we will sooner suffer any pain than turn traitors to anything received by us from the Œcumenical Councils and the holy teachers of the Church: we will either be martyrs in deed, or martyrs in will."¹ But time proved *Joseph* false to his own words.

Six spiritual lords of the great Constantinopolitan Church were to accompany the Patriarch to the Council, in the capacity of his councillors. Among them was the great Ecclesiarch, *Syropulus*, author of the history of this Council; also three hegumens, the Emperor's lower chaplain, three monks (hieromonachs), and several members of the Clergy.² Gregory, the Emperor's chaplain, called *Mammas*, possessing particular rights as

¹ *Syr.* iii. 16.

² *Syr.* iii. 15.

vicar, first of the Patriarch of Antioch, and then of Alexandria, closely attached to the Emperor, was nevertheless incapable of using his rights to advantage in the cause of the Church. His character—mean, irritable, without any set rules of conduct, and at the same time egotistical—repelled every one who came into contact with him, and made him an object of universal hate. It really is astonishing how such a man could creep into the confidence of the Emperor, a man always so cautious and prudent.

Many laymen also accompanied the Emperor to Italy. Besides the Emperor's brother, Demetrius, the despot, several court officers and learned men also joined the Imperial suite. High in the list of these persons, on account of his great knowledge of theology and philosophy, stood George Scholarius. Enjoying the confidence and good-will of John, he was at the same time on friendly terms with Mark of Ephesus, his teacher. The celebrated though aged philosopher, Gemistes Pletho, was also taken to the Council. His advice was sought by the Emperor at the beginning of negotiations with the Church of Rome.¹ In the Council he was a warm defender of orthodoxy,² and at the same time revived in the Florentines a love for Plato's philosophy, by his animated lectures on that subject while in Florence.³

November 27th, 1437, the Emperor, Patriarch, and other members of the clergy and laity, after many Te Deums in the great Church of Constantinople and the monastery of the Hodigetria, set out on their voyage.⁴

¹ Syr. vi. 10.

² Syr. vii. 8.

³ Gennadius und Pletho, von Gass. 1844, Breslau, § 27.

⁴ Syr. iv. 1. A particular ectene was composed for the occasion : "We

In the meantime Pope Eugenius, on the 18th of October in the same year, published a bull, in which it was said, that for the more advantageous union of the Churches and the bettering of Church affairs, brought by the Council of Basle into a condition worse than their former one, a Council was about to be convened in Ferrara, and that all the cardinals, bishops, and abbots are to remove immediately from Basle to Ferrara, to discuss ecclesiastical affairs.¹ Nicholas Albergati,² Cardinal of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem, at the Pope's commission came to Ferrara with several bishops (Jan. 8, 1438), and opened the Council. When Eugenius himself arrived with his cardinals to the second sitting of the Council (Feb. 14), there were already more than seventy bishops present. Then was read the Papal bull, excommunicating all present at the Council of Basle, degrading all the members of the clergy and laity from their respective ranks, and bidding the city magistrates expel all the Fathers of the Council from Basle, and that too in the course of a month, under pain of excommunication.³

The Council of Basle for its own part (in the sittings of October 12, 1437, and January 24, and March 24, in 1438) declared the Council of Ferrara and all its acts illegal; and after many invitations to Eugenius to come to Basle, excommunicated him, and finally demanded that all the bishops assembled in Ferrara should, in the

also pray for the peace, success, amelioration, and union of the Christian Churches." Syr. iii. 18.

¹ Bini Concil. t. viii. p. 274.

² Vita B. Nicolai Albergati in Act. 35 Maii, t. i., p. 467, et seq.

³ Fleury, cii. 92.

course of a month, come to Basle, under pain of ecclesiastical punishment for disobedience.¹ Thus arose a new dissension in the Western Church; and what was still worse, it was caused by those very persons who took upon themselves the duty of reconciling the Church of the East with their own.²

On the arrival of the Greeks at Venice, the Pope first sent Nicholas Albergati and then Julian Cæsarini, inviting the Emperor and Patriarch to Ferrara. Here, again, the Greeks questioned themselves, whether to go to Basle or to Ferrara. The Doge of Venice advised them to wait for the arrival of a new embassy from Basle. On the other hand, the Legate Christopher did his utmost to prevail upon the Emperor and Patriarch to join the Pope, more than once betaking himself to presents and the most eloquent persuasions. At last the Greeks fell into his snares.³ The three weeks spent in Venice acted so beneficially on most of the Greeks, and even on some of the bishops, that they called it the promised land.⁴ Here was another dangerous rock for the future defenders of orthodoxy! Comparing the miserable state of their own empire, then nearly overpowered by the Turks, with the luxury, liberty, and comforts of Western life, the weaker Greeks were easily tempted to a peace, promising much for their earthly welfare.

¹ Bini Concil. t. viii. Basiliens. secc. xxix., xxxi., xxxii.

² In this sense Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pope of Rome, under the name of Pius II., wrote: "*Risit Oriens Latinorum insaniam, qui, sibi ipsi dissentientes, aliorum unionem perquirerent.*"

³ Syr. iv. 12—14.

⁴ The identical words of Dorotheus of Mitylene, the historian of the Council of Florence. Synod. Flor. p. 6.

At Francolino, a village situated at about an hour and a half's ride from Ferrara, the Emperor was met by the Papal legate, the city governor, and other town officials. The next day (March 4) the Emperor, accompanied by his suite, the Pope's bishops and the officials of Ferrara, made his solemn entry into the town. The Pope, with the cardinals, bishops, and abbots, awaited him in the palace. On the Emperor's entrance the Pope arose, embraced him, and giving him his hand, which the Emperor kissed, seated him beside himself. After a private conversation, the Emperor retreated to the palace prepared for him.¹

The Patriarch arrived at Ferrara later than the Emperor. As soon as Joseph neared Francolino, a magnificent galley was sent out for him, and brought him to land with the bishops and the rest of the clergy. The next day the Emperor informed the Patriarch that the Pope expected him to bend his knees before him, and kiss his shoe. This was a sad blow for the Patriarch, who little expected such a welcome from his brother in CHRIST. While at Venice, he said to one in the Pope's confidence: "If the Pope is older than I am, I will respect him as a father; if my equal in age, I shall look upon him as my brother; if younger, he shall be as a son to me." In the afternoon six bishops were sent to congratulate Joseph on his arrival, and demand the usual obeisance to the Pope. The Patriarch told the bishops straightforwardly that he could only consent to a brotherly embrace; and, assembling his bishops, indignantly told them of the papal demand. The Metropolitan of Trébizonde reminded him that he was advised,

¹ Syrop. iv. 17. Synod. Flor. viii. 11.

while in Venice, to think upon the subject carefully; but then his answer was, that the Pope would receive all with honour and respect. The Metropolitan of Heraclaea declared, that he and the Metropolitan of Monemvasia, when presented to the Pope, did not kiss his shoes, and cared very little for his anger. Meanwhile, the Emperor sent another messenger, saying, that he was still disputing with the Pope as to the means of preserving the Patriarch's dignity. Joseph made the following answer to the bishops sent a second time to him by the Pope: "Tell me, why does the Pope appropriate such privileges to himself? What Council, what Church canon has confirmed this custom? If the Pope is the successor of the Apostle Peter, we are the successors of the other Apostles. And did the other Apostles kiss Peter's feet? Who has ever heard of this?" The legates answered that the custom was of ancient date, and that bishops, kings, the Emperor of Germany, and even the Cardinals, who are higher than the Emperor, remain true to it. But the Patriarch with great decision kept to his former demand of a brotherly welcome from the Pope, promising, in case of refusal, not to land, or let any of his bishops do so either. At last the Pope acquiesced to Joseph's demand, pretending a sincere desire for peace.¹

On the 8th of March, four cardinals, about twenty-five bishops, the city governor, with many court officers, came to the Patriarch, and early in the morning accompanied him with his clergy to the papal palace. The Pope, to conceal his forced humility from the people, would not give the Eastern fathers a solemn audience,

¹ Syr. iv. 18—21.

but received them in his cell. On the entrance of the Patriarch, with six Metropolitans, Eugenius arose, and gave him a brotherly kiss. The rest of the bishops next came up, six at a time, and kissed the Pope's hand and right cheek. During the presentation of the Greeks, the Patriarch alone sat on a low stool, to the left of the Pope, behind the legate Christopher, who acted as an interpreter: the other bishops remained standing. The same day the Patriarch asked the Pope's permission to officiate in the liturgy according to the rites of the Greek Church.¹

CHAPTER IV.

OPENING OF THE COUNCIL IN FERRARA. PRIVATE DISPUTES ON PURGATORY.

The arrangement of seats for the members of the Council in the cathedral of S. George was also the subject of many disputes. The Latins wished the Papal throne to be erected in the centre of the church, and the Latin and Greek Bishops to take their places at the right and left side of the throne. On meeting with a refusal in this from the Greeks, the Latins determined to move the Papal throne to the right aisle, and there construct places for the Latin Bishops, leaving the opposite side for the Emperor, Patriarch, and the other Greeks. Next to the Papal seat, a throne was erected for the Emperor of Germany; then followed the seats

¹ Syr. iv. 22, 23. Synod. Flor. pp. 14, 15.

for the Cardinals and Bishops. On the left hand side a similar throne was constructed for the Greek Emperor; next to him a throne for the Patriarch and seats for the Eastern Bishops. In the centre of the church a separate place was left for the speakers, or those, who were to enter into dispute with each other. But even then the Greeks experienced much that was unpleasant. The Papal throne differed a good deal, not only from the Patriarch's, but even the Emperor's throne, by being more elevated and of richer material. The Patriarch complained. The Emperor simply remarked, that there was nothing but worldly vanity in the arrangement of the Council, contrary to the rules of the Church.¹

Desiring to put in order the affairs of the Empire with the aid of the Western monarchs, John expressed his wish to the Pope, that not only the Western Bishops should preside at the Council, but also the sovereigns of Europe, or at least their representatives. The Pope at first refused to comply with the Emperor's wish, seeing an impediment for it in the different wars and dissensions between the different kingdoms of Europe; but at the Emperor's urgent request, he promised to send his legate to the Kings and Princes of Europe with invitations to the Council. On this account the discussions on doctrinal subjects were put off for the space of four months. But in order not to lose time, the Pope, with the Emperor's consent, determined on opening the Council, hoping to entice a few Bishops from Basle by letting them know of the opening of the Council, gain over the general opinion and thus strengthen the weaker party. According to the Pope's arrangement, delegates

¹ Syr. iv. 25, 26.

from both sides were to occupy themselves during these four months with private discussions on subjects of disagreement between the Greeks and Latins.

At the same time, the Emperor with great difficulty persuaded the Pope to allow the Greeks money for their maintenance, instead of the daily rations of food they were receiving like beggars, quite contrary to the agreements made in the treaty.¹ Generally speaking, the Greeks made constant complaints about this during the whole time of the Council session in Ferrara and Florence. The Pope found this the best way of making the Greeks obedient. For whenever the Greeks refused to comply with any of his wishes, he immediately stopped their pay, so that many of the Bishops were obliged to sell their clothes. But as soon as the Greeks agreed to his proposals, their wages were immediately given out as a sort of reward for their obedience. So it was at this very time. As long as the Greeks disputed about the Council seats, no money was given them. But when the disputes were ended, their monthly allowance was paid out.

A short time before the opening of the Council, new changes took place in the appointments of the vicars of Patriarchs. Gregory the chaplain was appointed second vicar of the Patriarch of Alexandria, together with the Metropolitan of Heraclea, and Mark of Ephesus, Vicar of Antioch with the Russian Isidore. It seems very evident, that the Emperor wished by means of these changes, to find in case of need among these representa-

¹ The Pope allowed the Emperor a monthly salary of 30 florins, the Patriarch 25, the Despot 20; 4 florins to the officers of the Imperial and Patriarchal court, and 3 florins to the servants.

tives of the Patriarch at least one on his own side. With this object in view he appointed Gregory and Isidore, persons both very weak in character, together with the firm defenders of Orthodoxy—Antony of Heraclea and Mark of Ephesus. Dionysius the vicar of the Patriarch of Jerusalem was then ill and died soon after the opening of the Council.¹ Ash Wednesday, the 9th of April, was fixed upon by the Pope for the opening of the Council. The Patriarch refused to be present under plea of illness, but gave his consent to the opening.

The Pope was the first to enter the cathedral, and immediately sat down on his throne in the northern aisle. After him came the Emperor, with his brother, the patriarchal vicars, and the Bishops, with the lower orders of the clergy, and sat down opposite to the Pope. The Latin Church was represented by eight Cardinals, a great number of Bishops and lower clergy.² On a desk

¹ Syr. iv. 27—29. Syropulus, who received the *γράμματα* of the former vicars and gave new ones to the newly appointed ones with the Patriarchs' subscription, does not tell us where he got the *γράμματα* from. Dionysius, Metropolitan of Sardis, died on the 18th of April, as is seen from the epitaph composed by Bessarion of Nicæa. Le Quien, t. 1, p. 666. Syropulus (v. 1,) mentions the 24th of April as the day of Dionysius' funeral.

² Different opinions are to be found concerning the number of Latin Bishops at the Council. Dorotheus of Mitylene before describing the opening of the Council, counts 150 Cardinals and Bishops (p. 17); but in the very description of the opening 200 are named (p. 20). Syropulus mentions 11 Cardinals and 150 Bishops as present at the opening of the Council (v. 3). But only 141 members signed the act of union; among them was the Pope himself, the Emperor, the patriarchal vicars, Latin and Greek Cardinals and Bishops, Hegumens, Abbots, and Hieromonachs. George of Trebizond reckons 400 fathers (Græc. Orth. 1, 579), but no faith can be put in his words, as he makes out 200 of the Easterns alone.

in the centre of the church before the altar, the gospel was placed, and on its sides the statues of S. Peter and S. Paul.¹ As soon as silence was enforced, the Pope exclaimed: "Blessed be the LORD GOD of Israel!" Some psalms were then sung, and prayers said, after which the Greek Archdeacon read the patriarchal decree inviting all to take part in the Council. "All the higher orders of the clergy, kings, and princes," the decree said, "are to send their vicars and ambassadors, if not able to come themselves. Whosoever will not come to the appointed time, and afterwards will not receive the decrees of this Council, shall be excommunicated from the Church." The Papal decree was then read, relative to the opening of an Œcumenical Council in Ferrara, and then this first short sitting was closed by hymns.

The Pope sent copies of this decree to the Western monarchs, urging them to despatch their envoys to the Council.² But all the expectations of the Pope proved fruitless. The Council of Basle continued to threaten the Papal throne, and threatened to excommunicate any one who should only dare to go to the Council convoked by the Pope. It is true, that the imperial court on Sigismund's death, declared that they would neither receive any Council decrees against the Pope, nor those of the Pope against the Council, but that they receive both the Council and the Pope. But not one of the western monarchs either approved of the Council con-

¹ In the Russian description of Isidore's mission to Florence, we find the following words: "and then bringing in, (the statues of) SS. Peter and Paul made of silver gilt, they placed them on the ground." *Ancient Library*, iv. 52.

² *Syrop.* iv. 31; v. 1. *Syn. Flor.* p. 15, 29.

vened by the Pope, or wished to oppose the Council of Basle, and sent no envoys to the Council convoked in Italy. It was only towards the end of the Council sittings at Ferrara, that the envoys of the Duke of Burgundy arrived; on entering the Council they kissed the Pope's slipper, but showed no marks of respect to the Emperor, behaving just as if he had never been present.¹

After Easter (April 13) the Pope required the Greeks to commence the private discussions. The Greeks delayed, waiting for the envoys of Basle.² But at last, after the Pope had repeated his demands three times, ten persons were chosen from both sides, who were to assemble three times a week in the church of a monastery, to discuss upon the different points of dispute.³ The Greeks chose from their side—the Metropolitans of Ephesus, Monemvasia, Nicæa, Lacedæmon, Anchialus, and five other members of the Council. The imperial officer Manuel Jagaris, was also ordered to be present. Strict orders were given by the Emperor that only Mark and Bessarion should enter into disputes with the Latins, who were, nevertheless, in case of necessity, to seek counsel from the rest; that nothing was to be said on

¹ Wissenberg, 1, p. 372. Synod. Flor. p. 297, et seq.

² Synod. Flor. p. 29.

³ Here a slight difference occurs between the narrations of Syropulus and Dorotheus. One says, that three sittings took place every week, the other speaks of two only. The former says, that ten members were chosen from each side; the latter mentions twelve, including the two notaries. One says again, that the meetings were to take place in the church of the monastery of S. Andrew; the other, in the church of S. Francis; but the last named church might have been in the monastery of S. Andrew. Syr. v. 3. Syn. Flor. p. 29.

the more serious points of dispute, and that a report should be made to him at the end of every sitting.¹ Generally speaking, the Emperor wished that the impossibility of reconciling Orthodoxy with the Latin doctrine should not become too evident before he had attained the object in view.

Soon after his arrival in Ferrara, Mark of Ephesus, at the instigation of Cardinal Julian, determined to write a letter of thanks to the Pope for the assembling of the Council; and noticed in it, that if the Church of Rome wishes to finish as well as she has begun, then she must retract her doctrine on the procession of the HOLY GHOST, and not perform the Liturgy in azymes. The Emperor on learning this nearly gave Mark over to the judgment of the Greek Council for daring to express such thoughts to the Latins.² And even now, when authorizing the chosen persons to dispute with the Latins, he bade them not reject the Latin opinions simply on account of their disagreeing with the Greek doctrine, but to look upon every question as not yet decided, and then by universal efforts attain its solution, looking upon the opinion of all as final and decisive.³

The Latins chose for carrying on disputes two cardinals, Julian Cæsarini and Nicholas Albergati; Andrew, the Bishop of Colossus or Rhodes; John de Turrecremata;⁴ and several other abbots.

¹ Syr. v. 3.

² Syr. v. 2.

³ Syr. vii. 8.

⁴ John the Spaniard, also called Turrecremata, a Dominican abbot, received his education in the University of Paris, and, for his energy in the cause of the Romish Church, received the Cardinalship from the Pope, and the title of "Fidei defensor et protector." Cave, Hist. Lit. t. xi. App. p. 143.

In the third sitting of the Council, Julian, after mutual congratulations, showed that the principal points of dispute between the Greeks and Latins were in the doctrine (α) on the procession of the HOLY GHOST, (β) on azymes in the Eucharist, (γ) on purgatory, and (δ) on the Papal supremacy; and then asked them which of these subjects was to be discussed first. The Greeks delayed discussing the first point till the opening of the Ecumenical Council, and promised to give a speedy answer about the others as soon as the Emperor's advice should be heard. The Emperor fixed upon one of the two last subjects to commence discussions upon.¹ The Latins agreed to discuss upon *purgatory*.

In the *fifth* sitting (June 4) Cardinal Julian gave the following definition of the Latin doctrine on purgatory:—"From the time of the Apostles," he said, "the Church of Rome has taught, that the souls departed from this world, pure and free from every taint,—namely, the souls of saints,—immediately enter the regions of bliss. The souls of those who after their baptism have sinned, but have afterwards sincerely repented and confessed their sins, though unable to perform the *epitimia* laid upon them by their spiritual father, or bring forth fruits of repentance sufficient to atone for their sins, these souls are purified by the fire of purgatory, some sooner, others slower, according to their sins; and then, after their purification, depart for the land of eternal bliss. The prayers of the priest, liturgies, and deeds of charity conduce much to their purification. The souls of those

¹ Syr. v. 7, 8. Synod. Flor. p. 30.

dead in mortal sin, or in original sin, go straight to punishment.¹

The Greeks demanded a written exposition of this doctrine. When they received it, Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion of Nice each wrote their remarks on it, which afterwards served as a general answer to the doctrine of the Latins.²

When giving in this answer (June 14th), Bessarion explained the difference of the Greek and Latin doctrine on this subject. The Latins, he said, allow that now, and until the day of the last judgment, departed souls are purified by fire, and are thus liberated from their sins; so that, he who has sinned the most will be a longer time undergoing purification, whereas he whose sins are less will be absolved the sooner, with the aid of the Church; but in the future life they allow the eternal, and not the purgatorial fire. Thus the Latins receive both the temporal and the eternal fire, and call the first the purgatorial fire. On the other hand, the Greeks teach of one eternal fire alone, understanding that the temporal punishment of sinful souls consists in that they for a time depart into a place of

¹ Syr. v. 13. Synod. Flor. p. 30.

² Syr. v. 13. The contents of Mark's answer, not published in Greek, are mentioned by Le Quien in one of his treatises, preceding the works of S. John Damascene, edited by him. Dissert. Damas. v. p. 65, et seq. Syropulus, relating the circumstances touching this dispute, refers his readers to the acts and notes of the Council about purgatory (*πρακτικά ὑπομνήματα περὶ τοῦ πυργατορίου*, Syr. v. 5); but these are not published separately, and are not even to be found in the Greek manuscripts. The answer of the Greek Fathers to the question on purgatory, given on the 14th of June, 1438, (not to the Basle, but the Florentine Council,) is mentioned in the book of Martin Kruze: *Turcogroecia*, p. 186.

darkness and sorrow, are punished by being deprived of the Divine light, and are purified—that is, liberated from this place of darkness and woe—by means of prayers, the Holy Eucharist, and deeds of charity, and not by fire. The Greeks also believe, that until the union of the souls to the bodies, as the souls of sinners do not suffer full punishment, so also those of the saints do not enjoy entire bliss. But the Latins, agreeing with the Greeks in the first point, do not allow the last one, affirming that the souls of saints have already received their full heavenly reward.¹

In the following sitting the Latins presented a defence of their doctrine on purgatory. As much as can be concluded from the answer given by the Greeks to it, they tried to prove their doctrine by the words of 2 Mac. xii. 42, 46, where it is said that Judas Macca-bæus “sent to Jerusalem to offer a sin offering,” remarking at the same time “that it was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin.” They also quoted the words of JESUS CHRIST, “Whosoever speaketh against the HOLY GHOST, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.” (S. Matt. xii. 32.) But their especial defence was founded on the words of the Apostle S. Paul (1 Cor. iii. 11, 15): “For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man’s work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 33, 35.

fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Different extracts were also made by the Latins from the works of the Eastern Fathers—Basil the Great, Epiphanius of Cyprus, John Damascene, Dionysius the Areopagite, Theodoret, Gregory of Nyssa; and the Western—Augustine, Ambrose, and Gregory the Great. They did not also forget to quote the authority of the Church of Rome in defence of their doctrine, and to make use of their usual sophistries.

To all this the Orthodox party gave a clear and satisfactory answer.¹ They remarked, that the words quoted

¹ The answer of the Greeks is usually thought to be the work entitled, *περὶ τοῦ καθαρτηρίου πυρὸς βιβλίον ἓν*, edited together with the works of Nilus Cavasilas and the monk Barlaam, without the author's name. (Nili Archiep. Thessalon. de primatu Papæ, edit. Salmasii, Hanov. 1603.) As the name of the writer of this answer is not mentioned, it is sometimes referred to Nilus Cavasilas and the monk Barlaam, though the manuscripts give no reason for doing so. (See Fabric. Bibl. Græc. Ed. Harl. t. xi. p. 384 and 678.) From the work itself it is evident that it was written (α) not in the name of one person, but many persons, who had undertaken so long a journey, *ἡμῶν πόνον ὑποστᾶσι κατὰ τὴν μακρὰν ταύτην ἀποδημίαν τοσούτου*; (β) that it was written to persons, who had busied themselves about the arrival of the Greeks to the Council; *ὑμῖν τε τόσον ὅ ὑπὲρ τῆς προκειμένης ἡμῶν συνελύσεσθαι προκαταβαινουμένοις σπουδῆς*; (γ) that it was written at the very commencement of the Council discussions, before other questions were settled. This is the reason why the persons who composed this work try to give a peaceful solution not only of this question but, if possible, of all the other ones, *οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ προκειμένου νυνὶ τούτου ζητήματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων ἴσως τῶν ἄλλων*. Ἄλλ' ἐκέλευον μὲν εἵνεκα μελεῖ Θεῷ καὶ μελήσει . . . (δ) that it was written in reply to

from the book of Maccabees, and our SAVIOUR's words, can only prove that some sins will be forgiven after death; but whether by means of punishment by fire, or by other means, nothing was known for certain. Besides, what has forgiveness of sins to do with punishment by fire and tortures? Only one of these two things can happen: either punishment or forgiveness, and not both at once.

In explanation of the Apostle's words, they quoted the commentary of S. John Chrysostom, who, using the word *fire*, gives it the meaning of an eternal, and not temporary, purgatorial fire; explains the words *wood, hay, stubble*, in the sense of bad deeds, as food for the eternal fire; the word *day*, as meaning the day of the

the defence (*ἀπολογία*) presented of the Romish doctrine on purgatory. All these circumstances direct our attention to the dispute on purgatory which took place in Ferrara, and not to any other one known to us. The writer of the History of the Florentine Council,—Dorotheus of Mitylene, remarks, that the Latins, in their second answer, adduced many testimonies from the saints, examples and arguments, using also the Apostle's words for this purpose,—*saved, yet so as by fire*. Synod. Flor. pp. 35, 36. All this found place in the defence also, in answer to which the Latins presented the work we have been examining. Syropulus says that it was Mark of Ephesus who wrote the answer to the Latin defence, v. 15. But this answer, as well as the first one, is not published. Le Quien, examining both these answers in his above-mentioned dissertation, quotes the principal ideas contained in this second answer of Mark. The same ideas, and in the same order, are also to be found in the work "On Purgatorial Fire," as well as the words quoted by Le Quien from Mark's second answer, *τί γὰρ κοινὸν ἀπέσει τε καὶ καθάρσει διὰ πυρὸς καὶ κολάσεως*. Dissert. Damasc. v. pp. 8, 9, 66, 67. All these arguments allow us to conclude that the work on purgatorial fire was either entirely or principally composed by Mark of Ephesus, and that it was brought forward by the Greeks in answer to the Latin defence of the doctrine on purgatory.

last judgment; and the words *saved yet so as by fire*, as meaning the preservation and continuance of the sinner's existence while suffering punishment. Keeping to this explanation, they reject the other explanation given by S. Augustine, founded on the words *shall be saved*, which he understood in the sense of *bliss*, and consequently gave quite another meaning to all this quotation. "It is very right to suppose," wrote the Orthodox teachers, "that the Greeks should understand Greek words better than foreigners. Consequently, if we cannot prove that any one of those saints, who spoke the Greek language, explains the Apostle's words, written in Greek, in a sense different to that given by the blessed John, then surely we must agree with the majority of these Church celebrities." The expressions *σωθῆναι*, *σωζέσθαι*, and *σωτήρια*, used by heathen writers, mean in our language continuance, existence (*διαμένειν*, *εἶναι*.) The very idea of the Apostle's words shows this. As fire naturally destroys, whereas those who are doomed to eternal fire are not destroyed, the Apostle says that they continue in fire, preserving and continuing their existence, though at the same time they are being burned by fire. To prove the truth of such an explanation of these words by the Apostle, (ver. 11, 15,) they make the following remarks: The Apostle divides all that is *built* upon the proposed *foundation* into two parts, never even hinting of any third, middle part. By *gold, silver, stones*, he means virtues; by *hay, wood, stubble*, that which is contrary to virtue, i. e., bad works. "Your doctrine," they continued to tell the Latins, "would perhaps have had some foundation if he (the Apostle) had divided bad works into two

kinds, and had said that one kind is purified by God, and the other worthy of eternal punishment. But he made no such division; simply naming the works entitling man to eternal bliss, i.e., virtues, and those meriting eternal punishment, i.e., sins. After which he says, ‘Every man’s work shall be made manifest,’ and shows when this will happen, pointing to that last day, when God will render unto all according to their merits: ‘For the day,’ he says, ‘shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire.’ Evidently, this is the day of the second coming of CHRIST, the coming age, the *day* so called in a particular sense, or as opposed to the present life, which is but night. This is the day when He will come in glory, and a fiery stream shall precede Him. (Dan. vii. 10; Ps. l. 3; xcvi. 3; 2 S. Pet. iii. 12, 15.) All this shows us that S. Paul speaks here of the last day, and of the eternal fire prepared for sinners. ‘This fire,’ says he, ‘shall try every man’s work of what sort it is,’ enlightening some works, and burning others with the workers. But when the evil deed will be destroyed by fire, the evil doers will not be destroyed also, but will continue their existence in the fire, and suffer eternally. Whereas then the Apostle does not divide sins here into mortal and venial, but deeds in general into good and bad; whereas the time of this event is referred by him to the final day, as by the Apostle Peter also; whereas, again, he attributes to the fire the power of destroying all evil actions, but not the doers; it becomes evident that the Apostle Paul does not speak of purgatorial fire, which, even in your opinion, extends not over all evil actions, but over some of the minor sins. But these

words also, 'If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss,' (ζημιωθήσεται, i. e., shall lose,) shows that the Apostle speaks of the eternal tortures; they are *deprived* of the Divine light: whereas this cannot be spoken of those purified, as you say; for they not only do not lose anything, but even acquire a great deal, by being freed from evil, and clothed in purity and candour."

In answer to the words quoted by the Latins from Basil the Great (in his prayer for Pentecost), Epiphanius, John Damascene, and Dionysius the Areopagite,—the defenders of the orthodox doctrine remarked, that these quotations did not prove anything to the advantage of the Church of Rome. They could not even find the testimony of Theodoret adduced by the Latins. "Only one Father remains," they continued, "Gregory the blessed priest of Nyssa, who, apparently, speaks more to your advantage than any of the other Fathers. Preserving all the respect due to this Father, we cannot refrain from noticing, that he was but a mortal man, and man, however great a degree of holiness he may attain, is very apt to err, especially on such subjects, which have not been examined before or determined upon in a general Council by the Fathers." The orthodox teachers, when speaking of Gregory, more than once restrict their words by the expression: "*if such was his idea*," and conclude their discussion upon Gregory with the following words: "*we must view the general doctrine of the Church, and take the Holy Scripture as a rule for ourselves, nor paying attention to what each has written in his private capacity* (ἰδίᾳ)."

The Eastern teachers said, concerning the testimonies

of the Western Fathers, that they were rather ignorant of them, not having any translation in Greek, and tried to excuse them by the circumstances under which they wrote, their misunderstanding the Apostle's words (1 Cor. iii. 11, 15), the difficulty of drawing a general conclusion from many circumstances (founded on visions), &c.

As regards the weight of the opinion of the Church of Rome pointed to by the Latins, it was found by the Greeks to be inconsistent with the subject then in hand.

Lastly, to the Latin sophistries, they opposed the more valid conclusions from the principles of the doctrine of CHRIST, from many works of the Fathers, from the parable of Lazarus, where mention is made of Abraham's bosom,—the place of bliss,—and of hell the place of punishment; and nothing is said of any intermediate place for temporal punishments.

The Greek answer was evidently intended to show the Latins the unsoundness of their newly-invented doctrine on the one side, and the steadfastness of the orthodox party in the faith handed down to them by the Apostles and the holy Fathers, on the other. In the course of the disputes the principal question branched off into so many light and abstract questions, that as a matter of course the solution of the chief one became still more difficult. The Latins for instance asked—where and how the angels fly? what was the substance of hell fire? The last question met with the following answer from Jagaris, the imperial officer: "the querist will get a satisfactory solution to his question, when he experiences the nature of that fire himself."¹

The question on purgatory not being agreed upon,

¹ Syr. v. 16, 18; Syn. Flor. p. 35, 37.

another one was proposed—that about the blissful state of the righteous, alluded to by Bessarion in his treatise on the difference of the doctrines of both Churches on the condition of the departed souls. It was asked: whether the saints, departed from this life, attained entire bliss or not? Before discussing this question, the Greeks found it necessary to have a private conference with the other members of the Council. With this intention all the members assembled in the Patriarch's cell (July 15,) and read over different testimonies of the Fathers; the Emperor bade them collect their votes. Some gave a negative answer to the question, founding it on the Apostle's words, (Heb. xi. 39,) others gave a positive answer. The next day, after a few disputes, the whole Council of Greek Bishops unanimously agreed, that though the souls of the saints, as souls, are already in the enjoyment of bliss, still when, at the general resurrection they will join their bodies, then their bliss will be greater; that then they will be enlightened like the sun.¹ This was their last answer to the Latin doctrine on the state of souls after death.

What then were the fruits of these tedious discussions? Did they conduce in any manner to the solution of the principal question concerning the union of Churches? No! The Latin theologians could neither find firm proofs for their opinions, nor would they give them up. The Greeks again would not receive a doctrine not founded on any good proofs, nor could they incline the Latins to receive the orthodox doctrine.

To the misfortune of the Greeks, their own party also became divided, a circumstance which prognosticated

¹ Synod. Flor. 37—39.

nothing good. Bessarion, generally speaking, was not very earnest in the defence of the orthodox cause, and if he did dispute with the Latins now and then, it was only to show off his powers of speech.¹ But meeting with a rival in Mark of Ephesus,² he became still more passive in the cause of orthodoxy, and began to nourish a feeling of hatred towards Mark. Obligated to answer the Latins together with him, he usually left Mark to refute their various objections alone. It was in vain, that many prudent persons tried to reconcile Bessarion to Mark at the very commencement of the former's enmity to the latter, even calling to their aid the authority of the Patriarch, who by his meek reproofs might have ended the quarrel. The invalid Joseph would on no account meddle in this affair.³ Then again the cunning Gregory, offended that Mark did not find him worthy of being the vicar of the Patriarch of Alexandria,⁴ did his utmost to set Bessarion against Mark. Apparently he esteemed Mark, sat down lower than he did in the Council,⁵ voted after him, notwithstanding the privileges of a higher patriarchal throne were on his side; when his opinion was the same as Mark's, he never spoke of himself, but always said: "I am of the same opinion as the holy Metropolitan of Ephesus."⁶ But

¹ It is worthy of notice, that when the Greeks, seeing the obstinate opposition of the Latins to the truth, wished to terminate all the discussions, Bessarion alone insisted that they should be continued, the subject alone being changed. "We can still say many nice things," were his words. (πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ.) Syr. vii. 6.

² Mark was commissioned to write the Latins an answer about purgatory, and not Bessarion; but Bessarion did nevertheless give in his answer also.

³ Syr. v. 14—17.

⁴ Syr. iv. 29.

⁵ Syr. iv. 32.

⁶ Syr. vii. 10.

this was sheer hypocrisy. In the presence of Bessarion and the Emperor, he placed Mark lower than the Archbishop of Nicæa,¹ and found fault with everything he said, not caring about this self-contradiction.²

Thus it was, that as soon as the Greeks commenced discussions, there arose men who, separating from the true members of the Eastern Church, sacrificed the advantages of the Church to their own passions and advantages.

The disputes ended. More than three months had already elapsed since the opening of the Council. The Greeks remaining inactive, and suffering want in everything,³ began to feel dull and sorry that they had left their homes.

The Emperor, fearing that the discontented would prematurely leave the Council, ordered the city governor not to let any of the Greeks leave the town, nor to give any one passports without his permission and signature. He himself, having shut up the Greeks in Ferrara, settled in a monastery not far from the town, and spent his time in the field, hunting, as if he were even loth to remind himself of a business which had called him away from his Empire.⁴

¹ Syr. v. 14.

² Syr. v. 15.

³ The first pay-day of the Greeks was the 2nd of April. 691 florins were given them on one month's account, whereas their pay was due for a month and a half. Syr. iv. 28. On the second pay-day (May 12) they received 689 florins (Syr. v. 9) ; on the third day (June 30th) 689 florins ;—on Oct. 21, 1218 florins for two months. The fifth and last pay-day was at Ferrara, Jan. 12th, 1439, when 2412 florins were paid for four months (Syr. vii. 14). Thus, three months and twenty days elapsed between the third and fourth pay-day, and as much between the fourth and fifth.

⁴ Syr. vi. 1, 2.

As soon as the time fixed upon for the opening of the solemn sessions of the Council had arrived, the Greeks asked the Emperor to return to town and make some arrangements about the Council. The Emperor answered, that he would not even think of opening a Council, which was to be an Œcumenical one, without the ambassadors of the Western monarchs, and a more numerous assembly of Bishops than the present one. But the members of the Council instead of increasing only diminished in number. Many fell victims to a frightful epidemic; others, from fear, retired to their homes; so that at the commencement of the solemn session, out of eleven Cardinals only five remained, and out of one hundred and fifty Bishops only fifty were present. It was at this time that the Greeks received a proof of Divine protection. None of them suffered from the epidemic.¹

One addition only was made to the Council in the person of Isidore, Metropolitan of Russia, who arrived on the 18th of August. He had returned to Russia after the conclusion of the treaty between the Emperor and the Council of Basle (in the end of 1436). With him was to have returned Jonah, Bishop of Riazan, sent to Greece to be ordained Metropolitan. Arriving at Moscow, Isidore was received by the Grand Duke Vasili Vasilievitch with all due honour. But soon after his arrival, he began telling the Grand Duke that the Greek Church intended to unite with the Church of Rome, that a Council was convened by the Emperor and the Pope with this object in view,—to be followed by the solemn union of the East and West,—

¹ Syr. vi. 3.

and that it was very necessary that a representative of the Russian Church should take part in the Council. The Grand Duke answered, "Our fathers and grand-fathers would not even listen to an union of the Greek and Roman laws; I myself do not wish it." Isidore urged him to consent, pleading his oath given to the Patriarch of coming to the Council. "We do not command thee to join the Council in the Latin land," said the Grand Duke at last, "but thou listest not, and wilt go. Remember then the purity of our faith, and bring it back with thee." Isidore swore to remain true to Orthodoxy, and (on Sep. 8, 1437) left Moscow with Abram, Bishop of Suzdal, Vassian the Archimandrite, the Priest Simeon, and other members of the clergy and laity, in all a hundred. On quitting Russia, Isidore very soon evinced a violent inclination to side with the Latins. Received in Livonia by the Bishop of Dorpat, and the Orthodox Clergy, he first saluted the Latin cross and only afterwards kissed the holy Russian icons. The companions of Isidore were horror-struck, and from that very moment lost all their confidence in him.¹

CHAPTER V.

THE SOLEMN SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL. DISPUTES ON THE LATIN ADDITION TO THE CREED.

Eugenius was still expecting the arrival of his legate from France. And when he did arrive, the news were

¹ History of the Russian Empire by Karamzin. Ernerling's ed. t. v. pp. 161—165.

anything but favourable. France had secured herself from the Pope's influence by means of the pragmatic sanction (July 7, 1438) founded on the decrees of the Council of Basle; at the same time Charles VII., King of France, prohibited his Bishops from going to Ferrara.¹ At this juncture the Pope commenced pressing the Greeks to begin the formal discussions on the peace of the Churches. "You have been already seven months in Italy," he said to them, "and during that time you have signed but one paper—that announcing the opening of the Council."² At length the Emperor returned to town, and after several private interviews with the Pope determined on opening the State Session of the Council on the 8th of October.

In the preliminary discussions between the Greeks it was determined to settle all disputes not by the majority of votes, which could always be more numerous in the Latin party than in the Greek one, but by the general assent of one or the other side. Otherwise—said the Greeks—the Latins will have more than two hundred votes against our thirty. It is necessary that the votes of one party, irrespectively of their number, should, when taken altogether, have as much force as the force of the opposite party's votes. Those who shall leave the Greeks and join the Latins, and vice versâ, are to be strictly punished.³

Then, on calling together the six eldest Metropolitans, the Chartophylax and Ecclesiarch, two hegumens, with a hieromonach, and three learned Greeks,—Scholarius,

¹ Weissenberg, S. 379. Syropulus himself makes mention of this embassy, and the Pope's disappointment in his views on France.

² Syr. vi. 5.

³ Syr. vi. 9, 10.

Gemistes, and Amirutius,—the Emperor demanded their opinion as to what subject should open the discussions on the Procession of the HOLY GHOST? Was it better to begin by discussing whether the doctrine of the Western Church on the procession of the HOLY GHOST is Orthodox? Or, whether she had the right of making any addition to the Symbol, even if it had been a correct one? These two questions gave rise to two different opinions of the members present. Mark of Ephesus, and Gemistes, the philosopher, chose the latter question, and most of the others joined them. Bessarion of Nicæa, Scholarius and Amirutius, demanded that the dogma itself should be discussed upon before anything else. The Emperor, joining the majority, settled that the disputes with the Latins should commence with the addition to the Symbol.¹

Lastly, the Emperor gave notice that, on consulting with the Cardinals, he had arranged that there should always be three Council sittings in the week; and that in case of the Emperor, Patriarch, or any of those appointed to attend the sitting, being absent, the sitting itself should not be put off to another day. The place of the absent member was to be occupied by the next one in order. Every sitting was to commence an hour and a half after sunrise, and continue till the sixth hour of the day. The Greeks gave their consent to these arrangements, signing their names to them, and demanded the right of proposing questions to the Latins.²

The Greek party appointed the following persons to take part in the Council sitting:—the Metropolitans of Ephesus and Russia, the Archbishop of Nicæa, and with

¹ Syr. vi. 12.

² Syr. vi. 13.

them Gemistes the philosopher, the Chartophylax and Skeuphylax.¹ But in reality all the discussions with the Latins were entrusted by the Emperor to the Metropolitan of Ephesus, and the Archbishop of Nicæa,—the civil officers were forbidden to take any part in the Council affairs. The Latins, for their part, chose the Cardinals Julian Cæsarini and Nicholas Albergati; the Bishops—Andrew of Rhodes, John of Forli, and two Doctors of Divinity—monks; one of whom, John, a provincial of the Dominican Order, took a special part in the Council discussions.² The Cardinals announced the Pope's will, that all the Council sittings should take place in his palace chapel, under the plea that it was not proper for the Pope and a few Bishops to make their way to the Cathedral Church through a crowd of people.³

In all, fifteen sittings were held in Ferrara.⁴ Two

¹ Syropulus, the Ecclesiarch, was appointed one of the speakers on the Greek side, but at his urgent request was allowed to retire. Syr. vi. 13.

² Syr. vi. 13, Syn. Flor. pp. 43, 44. See also Oudini Comment. de Scriptor. Eccles. t. iii. p. 2342, about John de Monte Nigro, the celebrated divine of his time and Provincial of Lombardy. There his speeches are enumerated, pronounced by him at the Council of Florence, in the Greek translation.

³ Syr. vi. 14. Dorotheus of Mitylene gives us another reason why the Pope refused to open the Council in the former Cathedral Church, viz., the Pope was then ill with the gout. Syn. Flor. p. 41.

⁴ Here Syropulus and Dorotheus disagree a little with regard to the time and number of the Council sittings, and also as regards the way affairs were conducted in the sittings. Syropulus reckons that two sittings had taken place before Mark of Ephesus began reading the Council decrees on the Symbol of Faith; Dorotheus counts four sittings. Syropulus says that the first meeting took place on the 6th of October, the second on the 13th of the same month; whereas, according to

months passed away in disputes, ending just like the former ones, in nothing at all. Both sides retained their respective opinions. The only advantage of the Greeks was, that they defended the truth.

On the appointed day the Emperor and all the Bishops

Dorotheus' reckoning, the first one took place on the 8th; the second on the 11th; the third and fourth on the 14th and 15th of October. Syropulus again says, that the Council was opened by the speech of the Latin Bishop—Andrew, of Rhodes; Dorotheus refers this speech to the Greek Archbishop—Bessarion, of Nicæa; and says, that Andrew's speech was made at the second sitting. Syropulus says that Mark of Ephesus also made an introductory speech during the first sitting; Dorotheus refers this speech to the third sitting. And then, at the same time, they agree with each other in saying, that the reading of the Council acts was begun by Mark, on the 16th of October, the day of the third sitting, according to Syropulus, and the fifth with Dorotheus. Andrew's answer to this is referred by Syropulus to the three following sittings: fourth, fifth, and sixth; and by Dorotheus only to the sixth and seventh, and with the same dates as are fixed for the two last sittings by Syropulus. We find no other difference in the narratives of Syropulus and Dorotheus, except in the number of sittings; Syropulus' seventh sitting corresponds to Dorotheus' eighth one, the eighth to the ninth, and so on. Then, again, the eleventh sitting, according to Syropulus, took place on the 18th of November, and Dorotheus' corresponding twelfth one on the 15th of that month. What is the reason of their disagreeing with each other? Most likely it must be sought for in the inaccuracy and uncorrectness of the Council Notes, made use of by both the writers, as is to be seen from their both mentioning the Council speeches in one and the same expressions. In order to fix upon the time of the sittings, we can have recourse to the note about their time and number, preserved in our Russian memoirs of the 8th Council, most likely written by one of Isidore's Russian companions. *Antiq. Biblioth.* ed. 2, t. vi. pp. 37, 38. The Russian writer counts one sitting less than Syropulus, because he does not count the sitting, shown by Syropulus as the fourth. In the other notes on the time of the sittings he agrees with Syropulus, except as regards the time of the first sitting, which he, as does also Dorotheus, fixes on the 8th of October.

assembled in the Papal palace, which was already surrounded by crowds of people. The Pope also soon made his appearance. The seats for the members of the Council were arranged just as they were before in the Church of S. George. In the centre of the Chapel, between the Emperor and Pope, two benches were occupied by the twelve Greek and Latin speakers, who sat opposite to each other. By the side of the speakers stood the Greek and Latin reporters and translators.

Bessarion opened the meeting with a speech on the importance of peace between the Churches. In this speech he urged the Council not to spare any means for bringing the great enterprise to a successful end, at the same time supplicating the aid of the HOLY TRINITY for those assembled to investigate the truth, and for peace between the two separated parts of CHRIST's one fold. He praised the Pope, Emperor, Patriarch and all present at the Council, for their sincere wish and firm resolution of reinstating peace in the Church, and begged the Pope and the Emperor to honour the Council with their constant aid and furtherance of its views. A similar speech was also made by the Latin Bishop Andrew of Rhodes.¹

After these preliminary speeches, Mark of Ephesus broached the chief subject of the Council discussions. "Love was bequeathed by our LORD JESUS CHRIST," he said, "to His disciples, and His peace He left them: but the Church of Rome began to neglect the commandment of love, and broke the peace. At present that same Church, by assembling this Council, evinces a desire of reinstating the peace, but this she can only

¹ Syn. Flor. pp. 44—49.

accomplish by rejecting the opinion which has been and is the cause of disagreement between the Churches ; and the present Council will then meet with success, when it agrees with the Canons of the former Œcumenical Councils. With this object in view, Mark then demanded, that the Canons of those Councils touching the subjects of the present disputes should be read in the Council before anything else.”¹

This demand was just ; but the Latins of course could not accede to it, as such a step would more certainly have exposed the Church of Rome. This was the very reason why they contradicted Mark then, and afterwards in a private meeting did their utmost to prevent the Greeks furthering Mark’s demand. Two Cardinals, Julian and Nicholas, with several Bishops, came to the Patriarch’s cell, and there in the presence of the Emperor and many Greek Bishops, urged the Greeks to delay the reading of the Canons, or at least to change the solemn reading of the Canons in the Council into a private investigation of them.² But neither of their propositions received the consent of the Greeks. The Latins were obliged to give in, though at the same time they solemnly declared, that this reading would be for the Greeks alone, and that it had not received the general consent of the members.³ Every-

¹ Syr. vi. 14 ; Syn. Flor. pp. 60—75.

² Syr. vi. 18 ; Syn. Flor. p. 84. Dorotheus says, that the meeting in the Patriarch’s apartments took place on the 15th of October, and Syropulus on the 14th of that month.

³ Ἀναγνωσθήτωσαν ἐν ταῖς ὑμετέραις συστάσεσιν, ὡς ὑμέτερον δίκαιον, οὐ μὴν ὡς ἀπὸ κοινῆς ἢ ἡμετέρας θελήσεως, were John’s words, when the Fathers had assembled to witness the reading of the Council Canons. Syn. Flor. p. 36.

thing was done to lessen the solemnity of that sitting, in which the reading was to take place. The people were not allowed to enter the Cathedral in so great a number as before. The Gospel on the desk was closed, the statues of the Apostles were placed with their faces downwards, and no candles were lit before them.¹

On the appointed day (16th of October) the books containing the acts of the Œcumenical Councils were brought into the Council. The referendarius under Mark's guidance read one by one the definitions of the Councils and Fathers on the Symbol of Faith. Nicholas Secundini translated them into Latin. Mark of Ephesus now and then interrupted the readings by his remarks.

"Let us begin," said Mark, "with the acts of the Third Œcumenical Council, so famed for its symbol of the Nicene Fathers, and by the Canon of the Ephesine Fathers themselves on the preservation of the Symbol in its original condition." Thus, the seventh Canon of the Council of Ephesus and the exposition of faith drawn up at the First Œcumenical Council were read, showing that the Church strictly prohibited the use of any other creeds, after the Nicene, threatening in case of disobedience—Bishops with being *déposés*, and the laity with excommunication. When these Canons were read, Mark said: "The Fathers of the Council having passed this Canon, have by their own example shown a great respect for the Nicene Creed, for they would not allow the addition of *Theotocos*, a name so necessary in the economy of our salvation. In the Canon of the Council of Ephesus, plain reference is

¹ Syr. vi. 19.

made to the Nicene, and now the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, in which the dogma of the procession of the HOLY GHOST is more developed. To explain this, Mark said, that the Fathers of Ephesus receive both Creeds as one, and call it the Nicene Creed from respect to the Council which gave rise to it, just in the same manner as the following Councils also called it the Nicene Creed. Lastly, to explain the Ephesine Canon, and confirm all in the conviction, that this Canon prohibits not only the drawing up of any other Creeds, but also any explanation whatever of the Nicene Creed by means of any addition, Mark quoted the words of S. Cyril of Alexandria, who presided over the Council of Ephesus, contained in his epistle to John of Antioch. In this epistle S. Cyril forbids any change whatsoever in the Symbol, be it even in a word, or syllable.¹ This epistle, Mark continued, was read with many other epistles at the Fourth Œcumenical Council, which received and confirmed it.

Then was read the decree of the Fourth Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon (in the 5th act), commanding all to receive the Nicene Creed and Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creeds as one. "For the Fathers of this Council," added Mark, "on reading both these Creeds, said: This holy Creed is sufficient for the full knowledge of the truth, for it contains in itself the full doctrine on the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST."²

¹ "We prohibit," S. Cyril wrote, "any change whatever in the Creed of Faith drawn up by the holy Nicene Fathers. We do not allow ourselves, or any one else to change or omit one word or syllable in that Creed." *Binni Concil. t. i. par. 2, p. 430.*

² *Binni Concil. t. xi. par. 1. 252.*

Then followed the reading of the exhortation of John, Patriarch of Constantinople, to the people, contained in the acts of the Council of Constantinople (518), in which the Patriarch exhorts all to keep to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed steadfastly and unerringly.¹ The epistle of Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople to Pope Vigilius, taken from the acts of the Fifth Œcumenical Council, was also read. In this epistle the Patriarch testifies, that he receives all the definitions made by the four Œcumenical Councils, and truly preserves that faith which the holy Fathers explained and confirmed at those Councils.²

The Canon of the Sixth Œcumenical Council was also read confirming the Creed drawn up by the two first Councils, and received as a rule of faith by the three following ones.³ After that extracts were made from the two epistles of Pope Agatho to the Greek Emperor, contained in the same acts of the Sixth Council. In these epistles the Pope says, that the Church of Rome upholds the faith bequeathed by the five Œcumenical Councils, and takes great care, that all defined by the Canons should remain unchanged,

¹ "We must keep," said the Patriarch, "to the holy Creed drawn up by the Council of Nice by the grace of the HOLY GHOST, approved of by the Council of Constantinople, and confirmed by that of Chalcedon." Bini Concil. t. ii. par. 1. p. 732. In Mark's speech it is said, that this was taken from the acts of the fifth Œcumenical Council.

² "We always kept," says Eutychius, "and do keep the faith explained by the Fathers present at the four Councils, and follow those Councils in everything." This epistle is adduced in Mark's speech from Pope Vigilius, as it is all contained in the Pope's epistle, and is approved of by him. Bini Concil. t. xi. par. 2. p. 48.

³ Syn. Sext. Act. xviii. ; Bini Concil. t. iii. par. 1, sect. 1. p. 182,

nothing added or taken away, and be kept inviolate both in words and thoughts.¹

In conclusion, the definition of the Seventh Œcumenical Council was read, in which the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed is repeated. On reading the acts of this Council it was remarked, that all present at the Second Œcumenical Council of Nice exclaimed, after listening to this Creed: We all believe this; we all think alike. This is the faith of the Apostles, this is the Orthodox faith. . . . Let him who receives not this faith be excommunicated.²

When this passage from the acts of the Seventh Œcumenical Council, containing the Symbol of faith, was read, the Latins presented a parchment, in their opinion, very old Greek³ copy of the acts of this Council, where in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed it is said, that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER and the SON. With the exception of the addition to the Creed, this copy, on being compared with another copy then in the hands of the Greeks, was found to correspond to it exactly. The Latins concluded from this copy, that the Fathers of the Seventh Œcumenical Council read the Symbol of Faith with the Filioque addition. Cardinal Julian also quoted some old historian, who as it were certifies, that the Fathers of the

¹ Bin. *ibid.* p. 25. In another epistle Pope Agatho writes: "The Apostolic seat preserves the Catholic and Apostolic faith. We believe in GOD the FATHER, and His Only-Begotten SON, and the HOLY GHOST, the LORD and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the FATHER, Who with the FATHER and the SON is together worshipped and together glorified." Bin. *ibid.* p. 46.

² Bin. *ibid.* p. 685, 693.

³ Syr. says: ἑλληνικῶς ἔχον τὰ πρακτικὰ.

Seventh Œcumenical Council read the Symbol of Faith with the addition, but Julian did not mention this historian's name.¹

It was then, that Gemistes in short and plain terms showed the Latins the erroneousess of their conclusion.

¹ Some persons think that Julian referred to Martin, a Pole, Bishop of Gnesen, who says in his History, that the Second Council of Nice decreed to admit the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER and the SON. (Zoernikoff, *Tractatus de process. Spiritus S.* 1774. par. 1. p. 199.) This Martin lived in the fourteenth century, whereas the Council was held in the end of the eighth century: what force then can such a testimony have, when it is contradicted by many other copies in which the Filioque clause does not appear? Besides, many other arguments can be adduced to prove, that the Creed was not touched or altered at the Seventh Œcumenical Council; (α) how could an addition to the Symbol be made, without any allusions being made of the reasons for such an act, in the very acts of the Council? (β) The Fathers of the Seventh Œcumenical Council notice before they begin the reading of the Creed, that they "do not alter anything, do not add or subtract anything from the doctrine of faith, and carefully preserve the Creed handed down to them by the former Councils." (γ) In the very Church of Rome the Creed was read without the addition for a long time after the Seventh Œcumenical Council. In this form (i.e. without the addition) it was engraved by order of Pope Leo III. on silver tableta, in Greek and Latin, as is seen from the testimony of Photius in his epistle to the Bishop of Aquilea, and even the Latin writers: Anastasius, the Roman book-keeper, Peter Damian, and others. (Zoernikoff, *ibid.* p. 391.) The learned Latins avow themselves, that the Church of Rome allowed the addition in the Creed, when read during the Liturgy, not earlier than the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. (Le Quien, *Dissert. Damasc.* i. p. 13, 15.) (δ) The oldest Latin copies of the acts of the seventh Œcumenical Council do not contain the addition to the Creed. In Peter Pitheus' library such a copy, taken from a translation made in the ninth century by Anastasius the librarian, was preserved, but without the Filioque clause. Pitheus, *Hist. controversiæ de process. Spirit. S.*, Paris, 1609. See upon this subject Zoernikoff, pp. 198—202: Theophan. Procopowitz, *Theologia Orthodoxa*, t. i. p. 1072—1074.

"If the testimonies of your copy and your historian were just, or at least had been long ago known in the Church of Rome," said Gemistes, "then no doubt your Thomas Aquinases and the Divines preceding would not have made use of so many arguments to prove the validity of the addition. Instead of this, they might have simply referred to the addition made to the Creed by the Seventh Œcumenical Council. But your divines are silent about this."¹ Evidently the copy produced by the Latins at the Council, was forged at the time of the controversy between the Orthodox and Latin Churches on the procession of the HOLY GHOST.

On finishing the reading, Mark of Ephesus concluded by saying: "Thus, the Greeks, obeying the decrees of the Councils and the exhortations of the Fathers, and mindful of their oath, cannot admit the addition to the Creed to be a right and lawful one. Nevertheless they are ready to listen to the proofs brought forward by the Latins to attest the justness of their addition."

At the end of the sitting, many of the Latins themselves, especially the monks present at the Council, after having heard the Council decrees, and Mark's explanation of them, avowed that they had never heard anything of the sort before, and that the Greeks teach more correctly than the Latin theologians.²

Andrew of Rhodes answered to the arguments made use of by Mark against the addition to the Creed. In his lengthened speech during two or more sittings,³ he

¹ Syr. vi. 19; Syn. Flor. 85—117.

² Syr. vi. 19; Syn. Flor. 114—115.

³ Namely, during the sixth and seventh sittings according to Dorotheus' reckoning, or the fourth, fifth and sixth as Syropulus has it. Andrew's speech vide in Synod. Flor. p. 136, 183.

tried to prove, 1. That the words "and the SON" are no addition, but simply an explanation of the words, "Who proceedeth from the FATHER," contained in the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan Creed : 2. That such explanations are in no way prohibited by the Canons of the Councils : and 3. That the Church of Rome had a right of making such an explanation and inserting it in the Creed.

To prove *that the Latin addition is not an addition, but only an explanation*,—the Bishop of Rhodes entered into a preliminary discussion on the sense of the words "*addition*" and "*explanation*," and then applied the results of his disquisition to the subject in hand. "An addition," said he, "is the adding of something extra to a subject; an explanation is the exposition of what is within (intra) the subject only." "The addition of the 'Filioque' clause to the Creed," he continued, "is only an explanation of what is said in the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan Creed, viz., '*Who proceedeth from*' the FATHER." In proof, Andrew quoted the words of S. Cyril of Alexandria, which, in his opinion, admitted the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON likewise as from the FATHER. But even if such an admission were actually contained in S. Cyril's words,¹ still it could not

¹ S. Cyril says (in Johann. Lib. 9, t. iv. p. 810,) "I will pray the FATHER, and He shall give you another Comforter. (S. John xiv. 16.) The SON being a partaker of the essential goodness (*ἀγαθὸν*) of GOD and the FATHER has also the HOLY GHOST, just in the same manner, as this is understood of the FATHER,—not as an addition or something extra (to think so would be silly and even insane); but like each of us, has His Spirit in Himself, which He brings out from Himself. This is why our SAVIOUR breathed Him forth corporeally, showing by this, that as the breathing comes forth from the mouth of a man corporeally, so also is the Spirit (*τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ*) breathed forth from the Divine essence in a manner worthy of GOD." These words show, (1.) that the HOLY GHOST

prove that the words: "*and from the Son*" are only an explanation of the words—Who proceedeth As little proof of this idea is contained in S. Basil the Great's words, quoted by Andrew in favour of the Latin doctrine, for Andrew concluded from them, that it was impossible to represent the FATHER without implying the SON and the HOLY GHOST.¹

No better arguments could the Latinized Greek find.

In defence of his assertion, that the *addition of explanatory expressions to the Creed is no where prohibited*, Andrew made use of many arguments, which had no

with regard to the SON is not anything strange to Him, but is essentially united to Him, being of one and the same essence with Him; (2.) that proceeding from the Divine essence, He is poured forth by the SON. Not a word, though, is said of His eternal Procession from the SON.

¹ S. Basil the Great (Ep. 38, ed. Garnier) writes: "He who speaks of the SPIRIT, speaks of Him as He is in Himself, and of Him Whose SPIRIT He is; and has the SON also in his thoughts at the same time. And he who has received the last-named does not separate the Spirit from the SON, but confirms his own faith in Three, successively as regards order, but essentially united into One (Person). He who speaks of the SPIRIT alone, implies in his confession Him also Whose SPIRIT He is. And as the 'Spirit is CHRIST's,' (Rom. viii. 9,) and 'is of GOD,' as the Apostle says, then, as when a person, taking hold of one end of a chain, must as a matter of course pull the other end along with it; so he who attracts the SPIRIT, through Him attracts the FATHER and the SON also." It is evident that S. Basil here speaks of the necessity of a concrete representation of the Persons of the HOLY TRINITY as regards their substance, but not in every other case: otherwise it would be necessary to attribute the Incarnation, not only to the Second Person of the TRINITY alone, but to all of the Persons. Thus, S. Basil's words cannot be used as a proof of the idea, that if the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER, His procession from the SON is also necessarily implied. The same remark stands good with respect to the other words of S. Basil taken by Andrew from his Sermon on Faith.

reference to the subject discussed ; for instance, he referred to S. Paul's words : "*though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.*" (Gal. i. 8.) "And, notwithstanding this," said Andrew, "many additions were afterwards made to the doctrine of S. Paul and other parts of Scripture." The Fathers of the Nicene Council also added a good deal to the Creed of the Apostles ; the Fathers of the second Œcumenical Council, to the Nicene Creed ; the Ephesine Fathers again, taught many things not to be found in the Creed of the Second Œcumenical Council. Andrew concluded from all this, that the Council's prohibition only regarded the addition of false opinions to the already definite doctrine of the Church, but did not extend over the addition of explanatory words and expressions. But all this affords very little or rather no proof of the truth of Andrew's assertion. Apparently his subsequent arguments have more weight. (a) The Apostle Paul says : *one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all* (Eph. iv. 5, 6) ; the Church is one, and consequently her authority is (always) one. But if the Church at different times, in cases of necessity, allowed herself to make additions (to the Creed) ; then in after times also, she must retain this right. Our SAVIOUR said : "*Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.*" (S. Matt. xxviii. 20). (b) The Church must necessarily oppose all heresies, whenever they arise, by means of her doctrine, and consequently she must add at times different explanations to the Creed, which might help to secure her members from those false doctrines.

Referring to the Canons, and the testimonies of the Fathers, adduced by Mark of Ephesus, Andrew endeavoured to prove, that the Canon of the Council of Ephesus only prohibits the exposition of any other faith or doctrine, but those contained in the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan Creed; whereas the doctrine on the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON, Andrew repeated, is only an explanation of the words contained in the Creed itself. In answer to Mark's remark, that the very Council of Ephesus would not add the word "Theotocos," to the Creed; Andrew said, that there was no necessity for such an addition, for the Creed, since it speaks of the SON of GOD, as the true GOD, and of His incarnation from the Virgin Mary, implies at the same time the word "Theotocos." All the decrees of the Councils and Fathers Andrew explained in the same manner as the Canon of the Ephesine Council, though many of those decrees strictly prohibited any change whatever in the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan Creed, either in word or syllable (S. Cyril of Alexandria), or else plainly command the preservation of the Creed in the very words in which it was originally composed. (Pope Agatho.)

The right of the Church of Rome to make the addition to the Creed, Andrew founded: (a) on the testimonies of the Fathers, who, as he would have it, taught that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER and the SON; (b) on the circumstances which obliged that Church to make the addition, and (c) on the supreme authority and power of the Papal throne.

To prove his first argument, Andrew referred to S. Augustine, S. Ambrose, S. Gregory the Great, and S. Hilary; but, thinking, that the testimonies of the Greek Fa-

thers would have more weight with the Greeks, he made some short extracts from Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Anastasius the Sinaite, and Simeon Metaphrastes. All these quotations, when explained in their true sense say nothing in fact for the Latin doctrine. They either refer to the consubstantiality of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, or else to the temporary mission of the Spirit by the SON of God.¹

Explaining the circumstances under which the Church of Rome was obliged to make this addition to the Creed, Andrew said, that the Pope and a Council of Western Fathers had determined to include this addition in the Creed, as a refutation of the false opinions circulated by the Nestorians that the HOLY GHOST does not proceed from eternity. This happened, Andrew said, before the sixth Œcumenical Council. But history makes no mention of any such Council or Council decree. On the contrary, it is well known that even in the ninth century Pope Leo III. forbade any such addition to the Creed, and even had the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan Creed engraved on two silver tablets in Greek and Latin and without any addition.

Lastly, to prove the right of the Latin Church or of her head, the Pope, to make this addition of explanatory expressions, as the Latins called them, Andrew referred to S. Cyril of Alexandria, in whose works he purposed to

¹ The question as to whether the Eastern Fathers of the Church actually admitted the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON, was examined in the later sittings of this Council. For this reason we refrain from considering the force of this argument, for in Bessarion's answer to Andrew's speech, it was omitted and left until the subsequent disputes should take place.

find very plain allusions to the Pope's authority for doing so; but at the same time Andrew took good care not to quote S. Cyril's own expressions. Cardinal Julian in his turn referred to Pope Agatho's epistle read in the sixth Œcumenical Council, in which the Pope says, that all orthodox Councils and Church teachers always followed the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and that he fears being condemned by his LORD JESUS CHRIST, were he to keep silence on a truth, which he was commanded to preach to all Christian nations.¹ It would not have been amiss to have remembered that there were many cases when the Church did not conform to the doctrine of the Latin Popes, and that the same Council condemned Pope Honorius.²

In the following sittings the Greeks gave *an answer to the objections raised by Andrew of Rhodes and Cardinal Julian*. The learned Scholarius wrote a refutation of them and presented it to the Emperor, who handed it over to Bessarion of Nicæa, ordering him to place it before the Council.³ Bessarion first of all showed that the *addition to the Creed* must be looked upon not as an *explanation* contained in the Creed, but as an actual addition to it, for the Latins found it on another extraneous principle, such as, e.g., "all which the FATHER hath, the SON hath also."

All such additions to the Creed, even if they were really explanations, were strictly forbidden after the Council of Ephesus. It is not forbidden to explain the doctrine of faith. Before the Council of Ephesus the Church

¹ Bini Concil. t. iii. pars 1, sec. 1, pp. 27, 28.

² Ibid. p. 151.

³ The sittings were held on the 1st and 4th of November. Syr. vi. 21. Synod. Flor. pp. 183—216.

Œcumenical could insert such explanations into the Creed. But since the time of the third Œcumenical Council any additions whatever to the Creed were strictly forbidden. And this Canon was evidently not meant against those additions to the Creed, which disagreed with it, for those additions were always, even in former times, prohibited by the Church. In S. Cyril's epistle to Acacius of Mitylene, Bessarion continued, it is said, "The holy Œcumenical Council assembled at Ephesus has prohibited the introduction into God's Church of any confession of faith, but the one existing, which was handed down to us by the blessed Fathers, through whom the HOLY GHOST did speak."¹

Thus, the Council prohibits any other composition of the confession of faith, and not the exposition of another faith; prohibits this not only as regards private individuals, but the whole Church, and even puts itself under this very prohibition. The Fathers did not add "Theotocos" to the Creed, though the notion expressed by this word is nothing more than a short explanation of the doctrine contained in the Creed, and the addition itself was useful and necessary as a refutation of the Nestorians. The Councils following also did not insert in the Creed those dogmatical definitions, which had been drawn up by them, though they also served to develop the doctrine contained in the Creed, and though the doctrine of the Council on the Two Natures and Two Wills in CHRIST would have served as a firm bulwark for the orthodox doctrine against the Monophysites and Monothelites. On the contrary, we see, as far as we can judge from the acts of the Œcume-

¹ Bini t. 1, pars 2, Conc. Ephes, par. 3, p. 433,

nical Councils, beginning with those of Ephesus, that the holy Fathers of these Councils had received and confirmed the Creed in the same form, in which it was left to the Church by the two first Œcumenical Councils, nor did they make any change in it.

At the same time the holy Fathers found means of ministering to the wants of the Church, without breaking the decrees of the Council of Ephesus. The Church stood in need of new expositions of doctrine in the Creed; the Fathers made these expositions in their definitions (*ᾠγοί*) which were not inserted in the Creed, but published apart.

This method of acting does not prove that the authority of the Church has in any way been lessened since the Council of Ephesus, but rather testifies to her unity. Remaining true to the former decrees, the Church shows that she had always one and the same will. By these means she preserves herself, otherwise she would have proved false to her own decrees. Thus, the Church of Rome cannot excuse the addition she has made to the Creed by any circumstances or authority which she has appropriated to herself; for the Council forbids any addition to the Creed even in case of necessity. And as to the authority of the Church of Rome, Bessarion added, much could be said about it, but this was not the time, nor the place for such discussions; we know well enough what rights and privileges the Church of Rome has; we are aware of her power, as well as of the limits of her power. How can an individual Church arrogate to herself the right of making an addition to the Creed when the same right is refused by the Councils even to the Church Catholic?

The Latin disputants, on hearing this answer, sought the advice of the Cardinals and Bishops, which resulted in a tedious speech made by Andrew of Rhodes, and one quite irrelevant to the subject discussed.¹

In the following sitting (Nov. 8), in answer to Besarion's speech,—John, Bishop of Forli, repeated the arguments already made use of at the Council, backing them by his Latin Divines; he said, that the "Filioque" clause is not an addition of a new article of faith, but a simple explanation contained in the expression, "ex Patre," as the Old Testament contains the New, &c.²

The Latins at last perceived that the whole weight of the Greek arguments consisted in the definition of the third Œcumenical Council. This is why Cardinal Julian, who entered into a dispute with the Greeks after John, made use of all possible means to explain the prohibition made by that Council favourably for his own Church. It was made, said Julian, under particular circumstances shown in the acts of the Ephesian Council, and was in fact directed against the unorthodox creeds. It was thus. A certain Charisius, Priest of Philadelphia, came to the Council of Ephesus with a complaint against the Lydian Bishops, who had excommunicated him for not agreeing to receive the Nestorian Creed alone. At the same time, Charisius, to prove his orthodoxy, presented his own confession of faith, (which, though orthodox, did not correspond exactly to the Nicene Creed,) and also the Nestorian Creed.

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 216, 217; Syr. vi. 21. Both the Greek historians unanimously agree in this.

² Synod. Flor. pp. 218—242. The end of John's speech is not found here.

The Fathers, after having read both these creeds, found the Nestorian Creed full of false doctrines, and decreed that no one should dare to draw up another confession of faith, but the one received by all. Consequently, said Julian, if the Fathers did not reject Charisius' creed, as an orthodox one, though differing from the Nicene Creed, and condemned the Nestorian Creed, then the prohibition regarded only unorthodox creeds.

In answer to Julian, Mark noticed that Charisius' confession of faith, though not condemned by the Council by reason of its orthodoxy, was neither received as a creed of the Œcumenical Church, on account of its differing from the Nicene Creed, in many expressions. The Fathers found that Charisius' Creed was only an orthodox confession of a private individual's faith. And the Church, continued Mark, never forbade any one to confess his faith in different expressions, as long as his confession was orthodox, and not given out as a confession of faith for the whole Church. It is well known that, at many of the subsequent Councils, many of the members couched their confession of faith in whatever expressions they chose. Thus, the Pope Agatho, and Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, expressed their confession of faith in the Epistles read and approved by the sixth Œcumenical Council. The same is to be seen from those Synodal Epistles which every newly-ordained Bishop sends to the Church representatives in the East as a proof of his orthodoxy. This, then, is the reason why the Council did not condemn Charisius' creed, notwithstanding its slight difference from the Nicene Creed. But every newly-composed creed, even though orthodox, would have been condemned by the Council if it had

been used instead of the Nicene Creed for the teaching of catechumens at their Baptism, or, generally speaking, during Church service. And this is easily seen from the circumstance, that the holy Council of Ephesus, after condemning the Nestorian Creed, plainly and decisively prohibited the introduction of any creed, however orthodox, different to that of Nicæa; and this was done to preserve the Nicene Creed from any interpolations or changes. In saying this, added Mark, I do not judge for myself. S. Cyril explains the meaning of the Canon, and he was personally present at the Council. In his Epistles to John of Antioch, and Acacius of Mitylene, he explains this decree of the Council in the same way as it is understood by the Eastern Church, and as we ourselves have just shown.

Julian, objecting to such an explanation of the Church Canon, said, that the Council of Ephesus makes no difference between the private and general Church use of newly-composed creeds; but generally prohibits every Christian, whether belonging to the laity or clergy, to draw up any other confession of faith: hence Julian concluded again, that the Canon has force only as regards heterodox creeds. In answer to this objection, Mark showed that the Nestorian Creed, as was proved by Charisius, and could be seen from the signatures to it, was used not as a private confession of faith, but was offered to certain heretics, who were to sign it as a condition of their being received into the Church. It was with this object in view that the Council prohibited the drawing up of any new creeds—especially for general use in the Church. For this rea-

son it did not condemn Charisius' confession, which was in fact a private one, though it did not agree in many expressions with the Nicene Creed.¹

The Latins, however, obstinately repeated their former arguments in defence of the addition to the Creed. The indefatigable Cardinal tired his auditors with his long speeches; thinking his arguments invincible, he said to Mark, "If you adduce ten arguments, I for my part am ready to oppose ten thousand of them in defence of my opinion." And when he noticed that the Greeks continued to refute his arguments and proofs, he tried to incline them to change the subject of discussion. "Let us, holy Father," said he to Mark, "examine the very dogma itself, and if the addition to the Creed proves to be contrary to the Orthodox doctrine, why, then we will drop the subject and erase it from the Creed. If, on the contrary, it shall be proved that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the SON, then we must conclude that the addition is a correct one, and must retain it in the Creed."²

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 242, 297. These disputes took place in the sittings of the 11th and 15th of November. They re-commenced on the 4th and 8th of December (Syn. Flor. pp. 300, 304); but are not very minutely described in the History of Syropulus. One of Julian's speeches in defence of the Filioque clause was afterwards published separately by the Abbot Rudesino Andosilla in Florence, 1762.

² Synod. Flor. pp. 287, 289; Syr. vi. 22.

CHAPTER VI.

REMOVAL OF THE COUNCIL TO FLORENCE. DISPUTES ON THE PRO-
CESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST FROM THE SON.

These two months' discussions were also without any real results (from Oct. 8th till Dec. 8th): for each party stood firm in its own persuasions. The Greeks finding all their efforts to incline the opposite party to their cause unavailable, wished to return home. The Latins however kept repeating, that it was necessary to examine the very dogma itself, and managed first of all to gain the Emperor over to their opinion, who readily yielded to their persuasions, hoping to ensure the Latin aid in the cause of the Empire.

But when the Emperor told the Bishops, that he also wished for an alteration of the discussions, he received the following answer: "The very reason why the Latins try to make us terminate the discussions on the addition is, that they find no suitable and sufficient answer to our arguments. It would then be very imprudent to forsake so impregnable a fortress." Gregory the Almoner was the only one who joined the Emperor, and was soon promoted by him to the rank of *πρωτοσύγκελλος*.¹

The Patriarch sided with the Bishops in this matter. Twice did the Bishops assemble in his apartments to take advice of each other, and at last determined to tell the Pope, that the addition to the Creed inserted contrary to the Canons and the testimonies of the Fathers, must be withdrawn; that it was on this con-

¹ Syr. vi. 23.

dition only, that the Greeks would agree to begin the investigation of the dogma itself, and that in case of the Latins disagreeing to this, the Greeks would have nothing to do with them. At this juncture Bessarion of Nicæa declared himself to be quite of a contrary opinion. "Why should we not," he said, "discuss with the Latins on the very dogma? We can tell them many good things." But his voice was unheard by the rest of the Bishops.¹

The Greek Council coming to this decision, sent legates to the Emperor, who told him: "The Latins reject all our most forcible arguments on the question of the addition, and most dishonestly affirm that the decrees which anathematise every addition to the Creed have nothing to do with them. If then we pass on to the investigation of a dogma, in which the Latins found their arguments on the testimonies of teachers unknown to us, how shall we defend the truth? Leaning back on the Pope's authority, they will say whatever they like, and will then declare that they have proved their opinion as plainly as the sun's light: for they, contrary to all truth, are not ashamed to say that they have already made good the correctness of the addition to the Creed, though in reality they have proved nothing."

The Emperor reckoning only on the aid promised to him by the Pope, would not pay any attention to what the Greeks said. Concealing his real motives, he said: "The very reason of our coming to Italy was to make a strict examination of the doctrine on the procession of the HOLY GHOST, which has been the principal cause

¹ Syr. vii. 3, 6.

of the division between the Churches. If we leave the question undecided, we shall show that we have no strong proofs in defence of the orthodox doctrine, and that we either agree with the Latins in some respects, or else avow their doctrine to be true. In my opinion, we ought most certainly to enter into a discussion on the procession of the HOLY GHOST." After the remarks made by the Emperor, another Bishop, Dorotheus of Mitylene, also voted for a change of the subject then discussed.¹

Reckoning on several similar votes, the Emperor appointed another meeting in his palace to talk upon this subject. The Patriarch came, ill as he then was; after him came the Bishops. The Emperor pleaded the wants of the empire, and his own efforts to better its condition. "I have no children," he said, "no heirs; I seek not glory, but only the welfare of my Greek subjects." Isidore and Bessarion took his part very warmly. It was determined to decide the matter by votes. The Patriarch kept to his own opinion. The Bishops, persuaded by the Emperor's words, inclined to his opinion also. Mark of Ephesus simply said: "As you find it good to pass on to the discussion of the dogma itself, I can but consent if the others wish it." The Chartophylax, the Proteclicus, and Syropulus, were the only persons among the Patriarch's nearer officials who divided his opinion. But, notwithstanding this, the majority of votes carried the opinion, that *a discussion on the very doctrine contained in the addition to the Creed should be entered upon.*²

One obstacle alone remained to be done away with.

¹ Syr. vii. 6, 7.

² Synod. Flor. p. 306, 307; Syr. vii. 9—11.

The Pope refused to pay the expenses incurred by the Greeks during their stay in Ferrara, under the plea that he had been deceived by the town's people, and could not receive the income due to him from his own towns, on account of their distance from Ferrara and the different circumstances of war. He then proposed to move the Council to another place, the more so as it was generally expected that the plague would again break out in Ferrara. He pointed to Florence,¹ whose rich citizens had promised to lend him 40,000 gold pieces, if only the Council was held in their town. When making this proposition, the Pope on his part promised the Greeks 12,000 gold pieces besides their usual pay, and two galleys to succour Constantinople, and at the same time expressed his hopes of finishing all the affairs in the course of three or four months.

The Emperor was long ago aware of the Pope's intention to transfer the Council to Florence, and had twice sent several persons thither to arrange the matter;² but hid his intentions from the Bishops. But when his last agent returned, he then opened the Pope's plan to the Greek Council, noticing that, if the Greeks consented to go over to Florence, they would be sure to receive the salary due to them for the last five months. At first, the Greeks were quite against this journey, fear-

¹ At that time Cosmo Medici was at the head of the Florentine Republic,—a man well known for his riches and love of science. The Pope opened negotiations with Florence, through a Florentine Abbat, the learned Ambrose Traversari, a protégé of Medici's, and high in the Pope's favour. Syr. vii. 1.

² The Emperor first sent the Hieromonach Macarius to Florence, under the pretext that he wanted him to procure some valuable manuscripts, and then John Disypatos. (vii. 11.)

ing that the Pope would behave still more independently with them in Florence, than he had done before.

"We will not quit Ferrara," they said; "and why should we? Why can matters be arranged better in Florence than here? If the Florentines wish to help the Pope, then let them send out their promised help to this town." "But the Florentines do not agree to this," was the Emperor's answer: "they ask the Pope to transfer the Council to their town, and promise to lend him a good sum of money if he does. There you will be paid not by the Pope, but by the bank, and that too, at any time you like. You are aware," the Emperor continued, "that now we must choose one of the two: we must either go to Florence, or else to Constantinople; for the Pope cannot and will not continue the Council here. You would rather return home? But will it be prudent to leave affairs undone? Think only, how and on whose account we are to return to Constantinople. Where are our means for the journey? And who will aid our poor empire if we anger the Pope by our obstinacy?"

The want of means for the homeward journey, and the Pope's refusal to pay the salary due for the last four months, did more than all the Emperor's arguments to persuade the Greeks to obey the Pope and consent to go to Florence. They only demanded that the Pope should fulfil the promises made to them. The Emperor stood surety, that the Pope would not deceive them.¹

Another circumstance also troubled the Greeks a good deal. The Patriarch, when ordering the Bishops

¹ Syr. vii. 12; Syn. Flor. 308—315. The last assembly was held on the 2nd of January, 1439.

to get ready for the journey, told one of them to send on all extra luggage to Venice, and only take what was necessary, i.e., the vestments, as the union of Churches would take place in Florence. This so troubled the Bishops, who could see nothing in the past to ensure a good peace in the future, that the Emperor found it necessary to assemble them in the Patriarch's cell and quiet their suspicions. "I do not know," he said to them, "whether or not the union will take place; but, to say the truth, I expect it, and advise all to wish for it. Only I cannot make out, what reason the Patriarch has for affirming this so unconditionally. No Greek or Latin could have told him this, because no one knows anything of the future results of the Council of Florence. Was it revealed by God to him? At all events, let not his words trouble you: nothing is known as yet." After such an explanation, Mark began asking the Emperor to collect the opinions of the Bishops on the dogma, which was about to be investigated in Florence. "If all will agree, I am ready to begin the struggle in defence of orthodoxy. If not, I shall sit down with those who always keep silence in the Council." But this straightforward declaration of the most energetic defender of orthodoxy, so angered those whose consciences were not so very clear, that one of them, Gregory the almoner, turning to the Emperor said: "Your Majesty! did you appoint him head of the Council? If so, tell us, so that we might all obey him." Bessarion of Nicæa was just as discontented with Mark's words. The Emperor himself covered the poor old man with reproaches.¹ The very first sitting of the Council in

¹ Syr. vii. 14.

Florence showed, that the Emperor had already promised the Pope to find out some secret means of coming to an agreement. This serves to explain the Patriarch's words, and the reason of the Emperor's discontent with Mark's proposal.

On the 10th of January, 1439, the Papal bull proclaiming the removal of the Council to Florence, was read in the Cathedral of Ferrara. The plague was mentioned as the cause of its removal;—the plague, which notwithstanding the winter time was then so violent in the town, and promised to be still worse towards the spring. But, in reality, two months had passed since the plague ceased.¹

The Greeks were paid the money due to them for the last four months, and two florins each besides to pay the expenses of their journey. Nineteen thousand florins were sent to Constantinople. The Pope left the town with great pomp; but afterwards, fearing an attack from his ill-wishers, continued his journey with a very small retinue, and in the dress of a plain monk. Measures were taken by the Emperor, that none of the Greeks should slip away and return beforehand to Constantinople. On the 7th of February, the Pope, Bishops, and the rest of the clergy made a triumphal entry into Florence: soon after (15th February) the Emperor arrived.²

After a short rest, the sessions recommenced (26th February). In the first sitting Cardinal Julian reminded the Emperor of his promise to appoint a committee out of

¹ Vide Synod. Flor. p. 316. Syropulus says, that the plague had ceased. Syr. vii. 14.

² Syr. vii. 15; Syn. Flor. 315—320.

several members on both sides, to inquire into the means of making peace between the Churches, and asked him whether he had any such means in view, and if he had, to make them the subject of a public discussion. The Emperor answered him very ill-humouredly, that it was of no use talking about this; that there was no need of the Greeks alone discussing this subject; that they had decided to do so together with the Latins. At the same time he reminded Cardinal Julian, that the disputes on the addition to the Creed had not yet been finished; that all the Latin arguments had not persuaded the Greeks on the justice of the addition, and that the Greeks retained the right of re-commencing those discussions whenever they liked. The Emperor, however, at last consented to think about the means for a reconciliation. At the end of the sitting, he assembled all the Bishops in the Patriarch's cell, and proposed that they should discuss upon the means of reconciling the Churches. None made any answer to his proposal, and the only thing determined upon was, that eight persons from among the Council members should be appointed to enter into a private conference with the Latins on this subject. But this decision was not acted upon, for the Pope expecting greater concessions on the part of the Greeks, demanded that a public discussion on this subject should take place.¹

In the following sitting (March 2) the Latin doctrine on the *procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son* was examined. The right of proposing questions, which at Ferrara belonged to the Greeks, was here conceded by the Emperor to the Latins. Mark of Ephesus was

¹ Synod. Flor. p. 322—340; Syr. viii. 1.

nearly the only person to keep up the discussions on the part of the Greeks; Bessarion spoke later, when the means of reconciliation were being discussed. Mark met a skilful opponent in John de Monte Nigro, a Dominican provincial, famed for his dialectical skill.

John commenced by saying that all his arguments and reasonings would be founded on the authority of the Holy Scripture and the Holy Fathers; but in reality made use not of the Holy Scripture, but of different doubtful and spurious quotations from the Fathers, with which he had acquainted himself by means of very inferior translations; besides this, his very speeches were nothing but a display of scholastical reasoning. Instead of explaining the words of the Holy Fathers conformably to their own writings, he made use of various scholastical arguments to define the sense of the words contained in the different quotations from the Fathers.

Having stated his opinion, that the verb *to proceed* means *to receive existence* (λαμβάνειν τὸ εἶναι), John quoted two places from the works of S. Epiphanius, in which he tried to find a proof of the procession of the HOLY GHOST not only from the FATHER, but also from the SON. Both places are quoted, as they are to be found in the Latin version of Ambrosius Traversari, whose translations in general were not famed for anything like correctness.¹ The first place read as follows: "*The Father names Him—the Son, Who is from Him—*

¹ See Oudin's Comment. de Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis, t. iii. in his treatise; Ambrosius Camaldulensis, p. 2434. Hallam, in his History of European Literature, notices the incorrectness of his versions. Pt. i. pp. 79, 80.

and the Holy Ghost—Him, Who is from both (ὁ μόνον ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἐστίν).¹ The other quotations read as follows: As no one has seen the FATHER (ἰώρακεν) except the SON, nor the SON except the FATHER; so, also, I dare to say, no one has seen the HOLY GHOST except the FATHER and SON, from Whom He proceedeth, and from Whom He receiveth;—nor the SON and the FATHER, except the HOLY GHOST, Who of a truth glorifies and teaches all things; Who is of the FATHER and the SON (ὅπερ ἐστὶ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ).² Finding, in the first place, is from Both; and in the second, is from the SON, John concluded that according to the doctrine of

¹ In the edition of the works of S. Epiphanius, by the Jesuit Petavius, this place reads as follows: τὸν Υἱὸν καλεῖ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ· τὸ δὲ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τὸ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων, ὃ μόνον πιστεῖ νοούμενα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων. Opp. S. Epiph. Ancoratus. t. ii. p. 75.

² In the same edition this place is read in full, as follows: εἰ τοίνυν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ, φησὶ ὁ Κύριος, λήψεται. ὃν γὰρ τρόπον οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν Υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ, οὕτω τολμῶ λέγειν, ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ καὶ ὁ Υἱός, παρ' οὗ ἐκπορεύεται καὶ παρ' οὗ λαμβάνει, καὶ οὐδὲ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ δοξάζον ἀληθῶς, τὸ διδάσκον τὰ πάντα, τὸ μαρτυροῦν περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Ibid. p. 78. Considering these words in their full meaning, one sees that the addition of the verb *is* in the last words (Who is from the FATHER and the SON) is quite out of place, and what sense these words contain. S. Epiphanius all along makes use of the words of Scripture, or else speaks on its authority. He said at first, *proceeds from the Father* (παρὰ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται) and evidently implies the same in the end by the words, *Who from the Father* (ὁ παρὰ Πατρός). Having again first said, *He shall receive from Mine, saith the Lord* (ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται), he expresses the same in the end, saying, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Otherwise it is impossible to explain the reason of his using different prepositions *παρὰ* and *ἐκ*, if he only wished to express the idea of procession. Evidently he borrowed these prepositions from the Gospel text, which must consequently serve to define the sense of the words.

S. Epiphanius, the HOLY GHOST proceeds *from the Son* also.

Mark of Ephesus, without referring to the Greek text of Epiphanius, exposed the erroneousess of John's conclusion. He said that the words quoted do not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the SON. The expression, *to be from any one* (τὸ ἐκ τινος εἶναι), does not necessarily imply, *proceeds from any one*; it is used in different senses. S. Epiphanius does not say, *receives existence*; but only *receives*, and says this on the authority of the LORD's words; *he shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you* (S. John xvi. 14). If S. Epiphanius meant that the HOLY GHOST receives His being from the SON, he would have said, No one knoweth the FATHER and the SON save the HOLY GHOST, from Whom (plural n.) He proceeds and from Whom (pl.) He receives; and then the words *proceeds* and *receives* would be of equal weight. But Epiphanius, by repeating the pronoun *from Whom* (sing.) and placing the conjunction *and* between the two words, shows that he gives one meaning to the word *proceeds*, and another to *receives*. The verb, *proceeds*, is intended by him to show that the HOLY GHOST receives His being from the FATHER; and the verb, *receives*, to signify that the HOLY GHOST, being of one essence and substance with the SON, propounds to the faithful a doctrine agreeable to that of CHRIST Himself. This explanation of our LORD's words, "*He shall receive of Mine,*" *Mark* confirmed by quoting the explanation of S. John Chrysostom (on S. John, Hom. 78) and that of S. Cyril of Alexandria (Thesaurus, c. 14).

The book of S. Epiphanius was next brought under

notice. Mark showed at the very beginning that this book had been long since interpolated, and that the first passage must be read, *is known of Both* (καρ' ἀμφοῖν νοεῖται), but without the verb "*is*." It is not known what reading was found in the copy employed by the Council; but it is certain that in both cases the verb *is* was not to be found, a verb on which John founded his principal argument.

John, though he avowed that his mistake arose from an incorrect version of Traversari,¹ still continued to affirm that the verb *is* must be implied in the texts quoted, and on this supposition repeated that S. Epiphanius had an idea of the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON also. But even if we were to imply the wanting verb here, we still should have no reason to conclude that S. Epiphanius speaks of the HOLY GHOST's procession from the FATHER and the SON. His words may express the unity of substance in the Persons of the HOLY TRINITY. Thus, several teachers say that the HOLY GHOST is from the FATHER and SON, and from Their Substance, for He is consubstantial with the FATHER and SON.²

To ward off his opponent's attack, *Mark*, on his part, quoted the words of S. Basil the Great, in which he

¹ Syn. Flor. p. 470.

² An explanation of these passages from S. Epiphanius' works, and remarks on their being interpolated in the later Latin versions, can be found in Zoernikoff's work; *Tractatus Theolog.* pp. 814, 318. In order to understand Mark's words rightly, we must bear in view that the preposition *from*, in theological language, sometimes expresses not *procession*, but only a similitude or reception of attributes and nature, as for instance in the following words of our LORD: *Ye are of this world, I am not of this world.* S. John viii. 23.

plainly says that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER, and not elsewhere. This is what S. Basil writes in his fifth book against Eunomius: "God gives birth not like man, but truly gives birth; He from Himself manifests a birth—the Word, not a human word, but shows this Word to be truly from Himself. He produces the SPIRIT by His mouth not like man, for God's mouth is not corporeal, but the SPIRIT is from Him and not from aught else."¹ Receiving John's assent, that the birth of the SON as well as the procession of the HOLY GHOST belong to the Person of the FATHER, and not to His Substance which is one and the same with the Substance of the SON and HOLY GHOST, Mark made the following conclusion from S. Basil's words: "If the SPIRIT proceeds from the Person of the FATHER, then the expression, *not elsewhere*, shows that He does not proceed from another Person." But, in the subsequent disputes on this passage, the opponents passed over to the most minute questions on the relation of the SON and HOLY GHOST to the Person and Substance of the FATHER, as also on the relation of the Person to the Substance in the Divine Godhead—questions which, far from shedding new light on the disputed subject, only afforded new motives for discussion. Mark of Ephesus kept strictly to the expressions and definitions of the Greek theologians: John found his defence in the subtle reasonings of his scholastic teachers.²

¹ See the Russian "Works of the Holy Fathers." Year 4, bk. i. p. 199. See also Zoernikoff, p. 26.

² Synod. Flor. pp. 341—375. We do not here make mention of these disputes, which had very little to do with the object in view—that of examining the doctrine of the ancient Fathers of the Church on the

The third sitting (March 5) proved to be as unfruitful as the former ones. Not a single fresh passage from the works of the Fathers or the Holy Scriptures was taken into consideration.¹

In the three following sittings (7th, 10th, and 14th of March) one passage from the third book of S. Basil the Great against Eunomius was principally discussed, a passage more than once alluded to by John in his dispute with the Greeks. In the copy presented by John this place read as follows: "If the HOLY SPIRIT is third in dignity and order, then why must He be necessarily third in Substance also? That He is second after the SON in dignity, of Him receiveth and announceth to us, this is told us by the doctrine of faith; but that He is third in Substance is not told us by Scripture, and cannot be strictly concluded from what was mentioned above."

"This passage is taken from S. Basil," said Mark, "and is also spoilt in our MSS. as well as in yours; in Constantinople there are four or five codices in which it is read in the same manner; but a thousand of such

Procession of the HOLY GHOST—disputes which little explain the doctrine, even in the form it was laid down by the scholastic divines of the Middle Ages, and thus hardly show at all how their reasonings were looked upon by the Orthodox teachers of the Eastern Church. Instead of this, we will here point to the separate work of Mark of Ephesus, entitled, *περί τοῦ ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, συλλογιστικά κεφάλαια*, published in Greek, together with the Greek translation of Zoernikoff's work, t. xi. pp. 709—741. Here, in fifty-seven chapters, the learned Pastor of Ephesus uses the same dialectical weapons as the Latins generally used, against Thomas Aquinas and others. We also find here some more definite answers to John's reasonings, though he is not mentioned by name.

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 375—406.

copies can be found in which neither the meaning nor the words of the Holy Fathers are changed. Very likely this passage was purposely spoiled," continued Mark, "by some defender of your doctrine."¹ But John tried to prove this copy to be a genuine one, by saying that it bore no symptoms of being corrupted, that it was lately brought from Constantinople, written on parchment, very likely six hundred years old; and, consequently, before the division of Churches took place. This however was only a supposition. Mark's copy was also a very old one. The disputed passage read in it as follows: "If the HOLY GHOST is third in dignity and order, then why must He be necessarily third also in Substance? That the SPIRIT in dignity occupies the second place after the SON, this, may be, is taught by the doctrine of faith; but, that He is also third in Substance, is not taught by the Holy Scriptures, and cannot be well concluded from what is mentioned above."²

¹ Afterwards another copy of the words of S. Basil against Eunomius was presented to the Council, where this passage also remained in its corrupted form. Mark, on looking over this copy, found that it was written by the same hand as the first. Synod. Flor. p. 414.

² Works of the Holy Fathers, year 4, bk. i. p. 127. This passage stands as quoted by Mark in the different editions of S. Basil's works: Par. 1618, t. ii. p. 78; Venet. 1535, fol. 87; Basilis, 1551, p. 676; 1565, p. 139; 1566, p. 339; Paris, 1566, p. 218. Vide Zoernikoff, p. 219, et seq. The same reading is to be found in the Benedictine edition, reckoned the best. Paris, 1730: 1839. The learned editor remarks besides, that, out of the seven copies used by him, only one contained the reading defended by John at the Council of Florence. In the manuscript of the Moscow Synodal Library, (in Matthias's catalogue, No. 23, cent. xi.) this passage reads the same as the text of Mark of Ephesus. (Works of the Holy Fathers, year iv. book

Mark, coupling this passage with the above-mentioned doctrine of S. Basil, proved very clearly that the reading defended by the Latins was not the genuine reading of that passage. He pointed to the preceding words of S. Basil, which stood alike in both copies. S. Basil, refuting Eunomius, notices: "Eunomius says, that he has been told by the Saints, that the HOLY GHOST is third in order and dignity, and himself believes that he is third in Substance also. But he cannot say what Saints propounded this doctrine, and in what words. Has there ever been so bold a man as he to introduce such novelties into the Divine dogmas?" One sees from these words, continued Mark, that S. Basil does not admit that the Fathers call the HOLY GHOST third in dignity, and plainly refuses to admit of His being third in Substance. Since, then, S. Basil does not admit that the HOLY GHOST is second in dignity after the SON, why should he affirm a notion he himself

i. p. 129, and notes.) The corrupted reading is for the first time found in the Latin work of Hugo Eterianus against the Greeks, in the middle of the twelfth century; the same is alluded to by Bessarion, as is seen from the Greek version of this work (Allat. de consens. Eccles. p. 654); and also from its later edition (in Maximâ Biblioth. Patrum, t. xxii. p. 1176). But Nicetas, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, who in the same century wrote a refutation of Eterianus, though he himself also taught wrongly on the Procession of the HOLY GHOST, still quotes Basil's words in their genuine sense. This is testified to by Nilus Cavaillas in his book against the Latin doctrine of the Procession of the HOLY GHOST (See Allatius de Nilis: *περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος λόγος Λατίνων*. Fabr. Bibl. Gr. ed. vet. ad calcem, t. v. p. 65.) Lastly, Gennadius Scholarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the fifteenth century, also points to the correct reading of this passage in the work of Nicetas of Thessalonica (Works of the Holy Fathers, year iv. bk. i. p. 132, and notes).

refuses to admit; that is, why should he quote words which form the addition in the Latin reading?

John, admitting, together with Eunomius, that the HOLY GHOST is second in dignity after the SON, affirmed that this was S. Basil's opinion also, and defended his own reading by saying—(α) that the Fourth Œcumenical Council calls the doctrine of S. Basil firm and positive, whereas the reading, "may be, is told us by the doctrine of faith," admits of some uncertainty; (β) that, further on, S. Basil, to confirm his notion, that one must not argue from the difference in dignity to a difference in nature, points to the example of the angels. If we are to admit what is here said about the angels unconditionally, then in the same way must we admit S. Basil's words on the HOLY GHOST; i. e., that he, not consenting to admit a difference between His substance and that of God's SON, at the same time admits a difference in their dignity. To this Mark very justly replied, that to admit a contrary idea on a supposition, only to refute it on its being admitted, does not show any signs of uncertainty. In this sense S. Basil says, "That the HOLY GHOST in dignity occupies the second place after the SON, this, may be, is told us by the doctrine of faith." Farther on, the reference to the example of the angels only confirms an idea admitted by S. Basil on a supposition; and thus the force of his argument is in no way weakened.

To prove that the idea included in the supplementary Latin reading on the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON is quite strange to S. Basil, Mark referred to the Father's own words in his epistle to his brother Gregory of Nyssa: "Everything good, given

to us by God's power, we call an act of the all-acting grace; as the Apostle says, 'But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will.' (1 Cor. xii. 11.) But we will ask, Is it from the HOLY GHOST alone that the distribution of gifts to those worthy of them takes its origin? The Scriptures teach us to believe that the original Author of the distribution of gifts, which act in us by the HOLY GHOST, is the Only-begotten God; for the Scripture tells us that 'all things were made by Him,' (S. John i. 3,) and 'by Him all things consist.' (Col. i. 17.)" A little lower S. Basil continues, "Thus, whereas the HOLY GHOST, from Whom all good gifts are distributed among created beings, depends upon the SON, with Whom He is inseparably received, and has His existence from the FATHER, as from the Cause from which He proceeds, then in this He has a distinguishing attribute of His difference in Person, namely, that He is known by the SON and with Him, and is from the FATHER."

Notwithstanding the plainness with which these words proved the eternal procession of the HOLY GHOST from God the FATHER, and His dependence on the SON only as regards the distribution of gifts to His creatures, still *John*, purposely playing on the word *depends*, gave it a sense of procession by existence; and coupling to these words of S. Basil what was also said by him to Eunomius, made out the following syllogism:—"The SON is the Principle, as He is God from God; in what relation the SON stands to the FATHER, and depends on Him, in the same relation stands the HOLY GHOST to the SON, and depends on Him. This is why the SON is called second in order and dignity,

and the HOLY GHOST third. This order is the order of their procession." All this reasoning has no foundation whatever in the real words of S. Basil. "The sense of the verb *depends*," said Mark to his opponent, "is defined by the nearest words, *is inseparably received with Him*. And with regard to the expressions, *third in order and dignity*, they are not affirmed by S. Basil, who only says that Eunomius maintains such an opinion. It is necessary, however," continued Mark, "that the Persons of the TRINITY exist in some order between themselves. The only SON, Who shines forth after the fashion of the Only-Begotten, from the uncreated Light, must be placed after that very Light; and therefore the HOLY GHOST must be reckoned third, in order that He should not be taken for the SON, when not distinguished from Him in order."¹ Such also is S. Basil's opinion; otherwise, if he had placed the SPIRIT in the same relation to the SON as the SON is to the FATHER, then he would not have accused Eunomius as a bold innovator for having called the SPIRIT third in order and dignity.

Wishing to prove that S. Basil could not have refuted the idea of the HOLY GHOST's procession from the SON as a new idea, John quoted the words of S. Athanasius the Great in his dialogue with Arius at the Nicene Council, and in his epistle to Serapion. In the first place, according to John's reading, it is said, "If the HOLY GHOST is not from the Substance of the FATHER and the SON, then how is it that the SON places

¹ "Ἔστι μὲν ἀνάγκη καὶ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τὰ Θεῖα Πρόσωπα. Υἱὸς μόνος μονογενὴς ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου φωτὸς ἐκλάμπας, μετ' αὐτὸν ὀφείλει ἀριθμεῖσθαι, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο τρίτον ὀφείλει ἀριθμεῖσθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἵνα μὴ παρατάττομεν τοῦ Υἱοῦ, δόξῃ καὶ αὐτὸ Υἱὸς εἶναι. Synod. Flor. 430.

His Name in the tradition of sanctification (i. e., in the commandment of sanctification or baptism), where He says, Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST."¹ In the last-mentioned place, it is said, "The SPIRIT receives of the SON, according to the LORD's words, 'He shall receive of Mine, and shall give it unto you.'" Of the SON it is said, "I am come in My FATHER's Name," (S. John v. 43); and of the SPIRIT, "The HOLY GHOST, Whom the FATHER will send in My Name." (xiv. 16.)

If then the SPIRIT, compared with the SON, has the same order and nature (τάξιν καὶ φύσιν) as the SON has, compared with the FATHER, he who calls the SPIRIT a creature will of necessity think the same of the SON.² But Mark very justly remarked, in answer to the first premiss, that "we also confess that the HOLY GHOST is third in order in the Divine TRINITY; but for Him to be third in dignity also—it is really astonishing how you make out that things have been said which have never been mentioned anywhere!" With regard to the second place, Mark said, "S. Athanasius wrote this against the Pneumatomachi, who placed the HOLY GHOST lower than the SON, and called Him a creature. Wishing to prove that the HOLY GHOST is of equal honour and consubstantial with the FATHER and

¹ S. Athanasius, Opp. Ed. Montfaucon, t. iii. pp. 206—230. In the works of S. Athanasius, we read, not ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, but, εἰ οὐ ἔστι τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ οὐσίας, "if not of one substance with the FATHER and SON." This work, though, is regarded as not belonging to Athanasius.

² This place is more fully explained in Zoernikoff's work, pp. 759—761.

SON, S. Athanasius shows that the HOLY GHOST in Scripture is placed in equal order with the FATHER and SON, and has the same will and action. The teachers of the Church always used this argument to prove the unity of nature of one Person with the other. If S. Athanasius had reasoned as you do, then why did he not say, The SON has existence from the FATHER, and the HOLY GHOST from the SON; or, the FATHER gives birth to the SON, and the SON brings forth the SPIRIT? But he only compares their works in the economy of man's salvation." To conclude, Mark mentioned the very words of S. Athanasius, in which he calls God the FATHER the only source of Divinity.¹

John tried to defend his opinion by the words of S. Basil, taken from his homily on the Holy Baptism: "We must confess one FATHER, one SON, one SPIRIT: not two Fathers, nor two Sons, for the SPIRIT is not the SON, neither is He called so; and from the SPIRIT we do not receive any one, as we do (receive) the SPIRIT from the SON."² This is the real sense of these words, received by Mark of Ephesus. But *John* translated and explained the last words quite in a different manner.³ This dispute is remarkable for having given the

¹ In the homily on the consubstantiality of the SON and the HOLY GHOST with the FATHER, against the Sabellians. Opp. S. Athanas. Ed. Montfauc. t. iii. pp. 37, 48. The editor finds a very striking affinity between this homily and a sermon of S. Basil's, also against the Sabellians, (Ed. Garnier, Hom. xxiv.,) and for this reason places it among the doubtful works of S. Athanasius.

² This sermon also is thought not to belong to S. Basil.

³ The Greek words are, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τινὰ λαμβάνομεν, καθ' ὃν τρόπον ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰοῦ Πνεύματος. *John* translated these words thus: "We do not receive from the SPIRIT, as the SPIRIT from the SON." In

Latin scholastics an opportunity of introducing a question on spiritual gifts, viz., whether they were to be looked upon as created or not?

This question, besides having very little to do with the principal subject of the dispute, and the explanation of the passage taken from the homily attributed to S. Basil, afforded very little advantage to Mark in its decision, and rather lengthened the controversy than otherwise. Mark knew very well how many disputes originated from this question in the middle of the fourteenth century in the Church of Constantinople, during the discussions on the Divine Substance and actions, on the creation or non-creation of spiritual gifts. Even towards the end of the private sessions in Ferrara, when the bliss of the righteous was the subject of discussion, this question was also proposed. Mark at that time even declined to give any answer; for, says Syropulus, the Emperor had settled and ordered beforehand that

answer to this translation Mark said, very justly, that (α) it is not said, λαμβάνει τὸ Πνεῦμα, but simply, καθ' ὃν τρόπον ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἱεροῦ Πνεύματος; consequently, the verb remains the same, λαμβάνομεν: (β) that this translation, by its very meaning, does not answer the purpose of the preacher, who proves that there is one FATHER, one SON, and one HOLY GHOST. The first no one doubts; the second is proved by this, that the SPIRIT, though proceeding from the FATHER, is not the SON, and is called the HOLY GHOST; the third by this, that we do not receive any one from the SPIRIT, like we receive from the SON the HOLY GHOST, with His Divine gifts. The very order of the words requires such an explanation to be given. The Latin translator, on the contrary, introduced a perfectly strange idea, which had no real relation to the foregoing ideas. John, in the meantime, gave these words such a meaning as this: the SPIRIT receives the Divine nature from the SON, and we, the gifts of grace. The first is not created, said John; the second are created.

no one should dare to answer these questions.¹ And now Mark again, notwithstanding his opponent thrice asked him for an answer, kept silence. And this silence of his, for an impartial judge, was better than the thousand fine speeches which he could have made if he liked, on a subject not new to him, and one which of course he had well studied from the works of his divines. He could foresee what explanation would be given to his resolution; but, not wishing to give occasion for new disputes, kept silent. The Emperor, understanding what a sacrifice Mark was making for the general peace, took his part, and twice noticed to the interrogator that his question did not pertain to the subject discussed, and that the Greeks had not come to answer such questions.²

The disputes then continued with regard to other passages taken from the Fathers. But this sitting of the assembly, the sixth in Florence, was the last of those in which both sides took part in the controversy. By the time of the following sitting, the Emperor, weary with the tediousness with which affairs were carried on, commissioned Mark to prepare an exposition of the principal foundations of the Orthodox doctrine on the disputed subject.³

Thus, in the following sitting, (March 17,) Mark spoke before the Council; and, adducing one by one the passages of the Gospel and Apostles, the decrees of

¹ Syr. v. 18.

² Mark was often unjustly blamed for his silence on this occasion by the Pope and others; e.g., by Joseph Metho, in his objections to Mark's epistle. We shall see further on, that the Greeks would not discuss this subject, even when they had agreed to an union with Rome.

³ Syr. viii. 1.

the Councils, and the testimonies of the Fathers till the Third Œcumenical Council, showed how the authority of Scripture and the doctrine of the ancient Church confirm the dogma confessed in all its purity by the Orthodox Eastern Church, and refute the newly invented doctrine of the Church of Rome. Here is an extract from his speech:—

“First of all, GOD the WORD Himself, the First Divine and Teacher of Divines, in His last discourse with His disciples, told them, when imparting to them the secrets of theology, ‘When the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the FATHER, even the Spirit of Truth, Which proceedeth from the FATHER, He shall testify of Me.’ Here, by three expressions, our SAVIOUR has placed the three Divine Persons in their relation to each other. Of the SPIRIT He says, ‘When He is come;’ of Himself with the FATHER, ‘Whom I will send unto you from the FATHER;’ then of the FATHER alone, ‘Which proceedeth from the FATHER.’ See you not a strict exactness in this Divine doctrine? The words *when . . . come* show the freedom and superior dignity of the SPIRIT. When He says, ‘Whom I will send unto you from the FATHER,’ then He shows His own and His FATHER’S will of sending the HOLY GHOST. But when He says, ‘Which proceedeth from the FATHER,’ He shows the Cause of the SPIRIT, from Which He takes His existence. . . Why, then, did not the LORD say, after mentioning Himself, and attributing to Himself and the FATHER the mission of the HOLY GHOST, why did He not say of His procession, ‘Which proceedeth from Us?’ He would undoubtedly have said so, if He had avowed the proces-

sion of the HOLY GHOST from Himself also. And that the procession from the FATHER forms a personal attribute of the HOLY SPIRIT, and that consequently no 'Filioque' can be implied here, is testified by S. Gregory. Representing the personal attributes of the Divine Persons, he says, 'Keeping within the limits given us, we introduce the Unborn, Born, and Proceeding One from the FATHER.'¹ Thus, when the personal attribute of the HOLY GHOST is His procession from the FATHER, and not plainly a procession,—and the personal attribute must fully coincide with the person to whom it belongs, as a person, including nothing more or less in itself,—then, if there is a HOLY GHOST, He proceeds from the FATHER; and if some one proceeds from the FATHER, then it is the HOLY GHOST.

"CHRIST's disciple Paul writes in his Epistle to the Corinthians: 'Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the SPIRIT which is of GOD.' (1 Cor. ii. 12.) Let no one suppose that in this text one can imply the SON under the name of GOD. S. John explaining² this theology in his revelation to Gregory the Wonder-worker, at the mediation of the Virgin Mary, says: One is the HOLY SPIRIT, receiving His being from GOD, and appearing to men through the SON. It is evident, that here one must not imply the SON in the words 'receiving His being from GOD,' for otherwise it would not have been said, *and appearing to men through the Son*

"After the Divine Apostle Paul, let his disciple blessed

¹ Sermon on Theology, iii. Works of the Fathers, pt. iii. p. 54.

² [It must be remembered that the authenticity of this Apocryphal book was at that time not disputed by the Latins.]

Dionysius come forth Showing the difference of the Divine persons, he says: 'there is one source of the pre-essential Godhead—God the FATHER.'¹ Thus, if the FATHER is the only source of Divinity, and in this differs from the SON and HOLY GHOST, then neither the SON nor the HOLY GHOST can be the source of Divinity together with the FATHER. The same is said by S. Athanasius the Great in his sermon on the eternal existence of the SON and HOLY GHOST. We differ, he says, both from the Jews and from those who offend Christianity, who, denying God from God, say as the Jews do, that there is one God, not meaning that there is one unborn and one source of Divinity—the FATHER,—but implying that He has no SON or Living Word.

"But let us show you also the definitions of the Œcumenical Councils; they confirm our doctrine. The first holy Œcumenical Council by the mouth of Leontius, Bishop of Cæsarea, speaks thus to the doubting philosopher: 'Receive the one Divinity of the FATHER, Who hath produced the SON, and of the SON born of Him, and of the HOLY GHOST proceeding from the very FATHER and proper to the SON, as the Divine Apostle says: If any man have not the Spirit of CHRIST, he is none of His.'² (Rom. viii. 9.) The Fathers signify by the words 'proper to the SON,' that though the HOLY GHOST does not proceed from the SON, He is not strange to Him, is His own by essence, consubstantial with Him. Basil the Great teaches the same: 'The SPIRIT is called CHRIST, as essentially united to CHRIST.'³ If S. Basil

¹ De div. nominib. c. 2.

² Gelasius Cyz. in the History of the first Œcumenical Council.

³ On the HOLY GHOST to Amphilochius, chap. xviii.

had admitted the existence of the SPIRIT from the SON, as the interpolated book says, then he would not have said: 'as united essentially to CHRIST,' but 'as proceeding and receiving existence from Him.'

"The second Œcumenical Council wishing to explain the words of the Nicene Creed: '*and in the Holy Ghost,*' and to show more clearly against heretics, how it is that the HOLY GHOST is reckoned together with the Father and the Son, speaks thus in its symbol: '*we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.*' Here attention must be paid to the objects the Fathers had in view when writing these words. The Council wished to represent the manner of the HOLY GHOST's union with the FATHER and the SON, and see now how distinctly the Council marks the affinity of the HOLY GHOST with the FATHER and the SON. The Fathers did not say that the SPIRIT is reckoned with the FATHER and SON, but that He proceeds from the FATHER, and is together worshipped and together glorified with the FATHER and SON, that is, He is of equal honour, and consubstantial with Them. If the Council had admitted the SPIRIT's procession from the FATHER and the SON, why then did it not in speaking of the FATHER and SON say: 'Who proceedeth from the FATHER and the SON, Who with the FATHER and the SON is together worshipped and together glorified?' This is what should have been said if the Council had adhered to such a doctrine. But whereas, in the first case, the Fathers did not mention the SON, when they were showing the cause of the procession, and did mention Him in the second

place when showing His equality of honour and consubstantiality, then it is plain, that they did not admit of the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON also. That this explanation is a perfect one, and not half-perfect, as you say, is evident from this, that none of the subsequent Councils gave any new version to the explanation and did not add, that the SPIRIT proceeds from the SON. On the contrary, all the Councils have prohibited and reprov'd this addition by their decrees, as if prophetically foreseeing what would happen among you.

"*Gregory the Theologian* says quite conformably with himself and the other Fathers: 'Everything the FATHER has belongs to the SON, with the exception of causality.'

"*The third Œcumenical Council* having listened to the Nestorian Creed (presented by the presbyter Charisius), which, among other things, contained the following: 'The HOLY GHOST is not the SON, neither does He take His existence through the SON,'—received and approved of this theology, as being that of the Fathers and conformable with the Divine Scripture—without making any objection against it. But in its decree on the Creed, the Council remarked: 'if any, whether Bishops, or priests, or laymen, shall be discovered either holding or teaching the things contained in the exposition, which was exhibited by the presbyter Charisius concerning the incarnation of the only-begotten SON of GOD, or¹ the impious and profane doctrine of Nestorius, they shall be subjected to the sentence of this holy and Œcumenical Synod.'² See, my Fathers, what doctrine in this

¹ Canon VII. Instead of "or," Mark of Ephesus used *τὸν ἐκείνου*.

² Canons of the Church. Hammond, p. 69.

Creed the Council calls impious and profane? The doctrine on the incarnation of the only-begotten SON of GOD. Thus, we see, that the dogmas relating to theology¹ were found by the Council to be sound, religious, and meriting no reproof. This also is no small argument in favour of the universal doctrine of the Church, that the HOLY GHOST does not proceed from the SON.

“And when Cyril the blessed, disputing with Nestorius on the procession of the HOLY GHOST, gave some reason to think that he admitted the SPIRIT’S procession from the SON, then Theodoret, rebuking him in the name of the Eastern Bishops, wrote: ‘If he (Cyril of Alexandria,) calls the SPIRIT proper to the SON, in the sense that He is consubstantial with the SON and proceeds from the FATHER; then we agree with him and call his words orthodox. But if in the sense, that the SPIRIT receives His existence from the SON, or through the SON, then we reject his words as evil and blasphemous. For we believe the LORD, Who said: The SPIRIT of truth, which proceedeth from the FATHER.’ Answering this accusation in a letter to a certain Bishop—Eutropius, Cyril complains of being slandered by him on account of his enmity towards himself and his friendship with Nestorius. He also wrote in his apology, that ‘though the SPIRIT proceeds from the FATHER, still He is no alien to the SON, for the SON has everything jointly with the FATHER.’ See, how he agrees with that part of the doctrine in which Theodoret agrees with him. Lastly, on the conclusion of peace with the

¹ Θεολογία. The old Fathers usually used this word to denote the intrinsic doctrine on the Divinity, and to distinguish it from the doctrine on the Incarnation, or the economy of the salvation of mankind.

Easterns, Cyril the blessed wrote on the same subject to John of Antioch. Here he again speaks of the procession of the HOLY GHOST and of the Creed: 'We do not allow ourselves or others to change a single expression in the Symbol of Faith, to omit one syllable, ever mindful of him who said: Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set, (Prov. xxii. 28,) for it was not they who spoke, but the Spirit of God and FATHER, which proceedeth from Him, but is not alien to the SON, as regards His essence.' You can see from this also, to what part of Theodoret's division Cyril agrees to. On the receipt of this epistle by the Easterns, Theodoret finding this theology conformable with his own doctrine and that of Scripture, wrote to John of Antioch as follows: 'The last epistle (of Cyril) is adorned with Gospel honesty; for in it, our LORD JESUS CHRIST is received as perfect God and perfect man, and the HOLY GHOST not receiving His existence from or through the SON, but as proceeding from the FATHER and proper to the SON. Finding this epistle correct we have given praise to Him, Who has healed the stammerers and changed discordant sounds into a perfect harmony.'

"We see from all this," concluded Mark, "that we teach conformably with Holy Scripture, and the holy Fathers, and Teachers, nothing changing or misrepresenting in the dogmas handed down to us, nothing adding to them, or taking from them, and adding nothing new."

John several times interrupted Mark's speech with his remarks, that he had diverged from the fixed order of the dispute. But the defender of orthodoxy answered: "All the preceding sittings passed in the examination

of two or three passages from the Fathers. This way of conducting the dispute must not last for ever, and we have therefore agreed to offer our arguments concretely, extracting them not from any spurious or little known sources, not from doubtful and corrupted places, but from the Holy Scriptures, and by all received passages from the Fathers. If we continue to dwell upon one and the same subject, there will be no end of our refutations of your words and answers."

After this, John also found it expedient to make a solemn proclamation, that "the Church of Rome does not admit of two principles or causes in the Trinity, but only one cause and one principle, anathematising all who think to the contrary."¹ Here John intentionally avoided a full explanation of what he meant, for he never refused to admit the SON as a cause of the HOLY GHOST, but said, that the FATHER is the original cause of the SPIRIT, and that the SON derives power from the FATHER to educe the SPIRIT not from Himself, but from the FATHER.² John's words were not without their influence.

The Emperor deeming everything done on his own part to sustain orthodoxy, appointed a separate assembly of Greeks at the Patriarch's residence. There, he showed the Bishops, that the time was passing by very quickly, whereas the disputes had advanced matters a very little farther. It is time, said he, to terminate the disputes and seek other means for our reconciliation

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 511—550.

² Synod. Flor. pp. 492—493. Ὁ Υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς λαμβάνει καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ προβάλλειν τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐκ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλ' ἐξ ἐκείνου κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἀρχυειδῶς καὶ ἀπλῶς αἰτίον τοῦ Πνεύματος ὁ Πατήρ.

with the Latin Church. These means are in your hands, my fathers! Brother John has said before the whole of the Council, that the Latins admit one cause of the SON and the HOLY GHOST—the FATHER. The Emperor then showed a written exposition of the doctrine, given to him by John.

But the Bishops, knowing well what double meaning lurked under the expressions used by John in the written exposition of the Latin doctrine, sought another, firmer foundation for peace. The attention of all was turned to the epistle of Maximus the Confessor, (seventh century,) who in his time wrote in the following manner about the Roman Christians:—"Adducing the testimony of the Roman Fathers and of Cyril of Alexandria (from his exposition on the Gospel of S. John), the Romans do not affirm that the SON is the Cause of the SPIRIT, for they know that the Cause of the SON and of the SPIRIT is the FATHER of One by birth, and of the Other by procession; but only show that the SPIRIT is sent through the SON, and thereby express the affinity and the indifference of their essence."¹ The Greeks received this testimony of Maximus about the ancient Romans with great pleasure. "If the Latins teach on the doctrine of the procession of the HOLY GHOST conformably with the testimony of Maximus," said the Greek bishops, "then no further discussions are necessary, and the former union of Churches can take place." The Latins, however, would not agree to this. They

¹ Mark's last idea is thus expressed: ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ προίεναι καὶ ταύτη τὸ συναφὲς τῆς οὐσίας καὶ ἀπαράλλακτον παραστήσωσι. The meaning of these words can be defined by the translation and explanation of the Latin writer, Anastasius the librarian. (ix. c.) Zoernikoff, p. 409.

wanted to have the last word, and demanded a continuation of the Council sittings. It was very reluctantly that the Emperor again appeared at the Council. In order not to recommence the disputes, he prohibited the re-appearance of the two combatants for orthodoxy, —Mark of Ephesus and Anthony of Heraclea.¹

In the course of the last two solemn sittings (March 21 and 24), when John the Provincial, noticing the absence of his energetic opponent, obstinately demanded Mark's re-appearance, the Emperor answered this boastful scholastic, "We do not wish to renew the disputes at present; this is why Mark is absent. We have come here only to satisfy your demands. Say what you will, we will give no answer."

Thus, during both the last sittings, John was the only orator at the Council. In the first sitting he quoted the testimonies of the Eastern Fathers and Teachers, which, in his opinion, confirmed the doctrine of the Church of Rome. In the last sitting, he, not so much refuting as changing Mark's words, adduced the words of the Eastern Fathers, apparently agreeable to this doctrine. None of the Greeks said a word in return; such was the Emperor's will. Only, towards the end of the sitting, Isidore of Russia observed to John, that he who remains alone on the course vainly thinks himself conqueror, when there are no rivals to compete with him.²

The solemn session ended. The Pope sent to the Patriarch, saying, that as the Greeks had refused to

¹ Syn. Flor. pp. 550—554. Dorotheus positively says that these two Bishops were forbidden to re-appear at the Council, p. 554.

² Syn. Flor. pp. 555, 562.

continue the disputes, they must either express their consent to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, or return home by Easter (April 5).¹

CHAPTER VII.

SECRET MEANS FOR RECONCILING THE GREEKS TO THE LATIN DOCTRINE ON THE FILIOQUE CLAUSE.

From about this time commences a tedious and heavy struggle between the Emperor's conscience and the demands of the Latins; between views of aiding his empire and fears of falling under the general accusation of treason to Orthodoxy. All hope of a true Christian peace for the Church was lost. It was to be bought at a bargain. How, then, could he give this bargain a more honest appearance? how could he give the least account of it before his own Church, before his own people? Such were the principal questions forming an uneasy theme for the on all sides oppressed Emperor!

In the private sittings of the Greeks he said, "I am the defender of the Church. The duty of a defender in this case consists, firstly, in preserving and defending the doctrine of the Church, in giving liberty to any one wishing to defend it, and in keeping back persons inclined to dispute and contradict; secondly, to keep all our people in unity of spirit."² At another time, when the tired Greeks asked him to end the disputes as soon as possible, he answered, "This depends not on

¹ Syn. Flor. p. 563.

² Syr. viii. 5.

me, but on the Church. If I act firmly, and any harm happens, the general displeasure will fall upon me. This is a Church affair, and requires great circumspection and a Church Council."¹ When the Pope and Cardinals hurried him on to conclude peace, he again answered, "I am no lord over the Council; I desire no forced union."²

Thus spoke and thus apparently acted the Emperor, deciding upon nothing without the Bishops' advice, and in the meantime using different means to attain the object he had in view. He became very intimate with the members most devoted to the union—Bessarion of Nice, Isidore of Russia, and Gregory the Syncellus. With these he took counsel, and by means of them he inclined the minds of the other members to his wished-for aim.³

In order to understand the matter better, it is worth noticing why these persons were so eager for an union with the Church of Rome. Bessarion assured his friends that he inclined to the Latin side, because he was persuaded by the number of testimonies which seemed to confirm the Latin doctrine on the procession of the HOLY GHOST. But we have seen how signal a victory was gained over these false arguments by Mark of Ephesus. The learned Bessarion could not but feel this also, for he did not contradict Mark, neither did he ask him to solve his misunderstandings. If he had been sincerely attached to his old faith, then surely it would not have been so easy a matter for him to change it. No! it was no love of truth, but other objects in view, that prevailed upon him to side with the Latins; and most

¹ Syr. viii. 7.

² Syn. Flor. pp. 590, 595.

³ Syr. viii. 4.

likely a wish to afford John pleasure, and a hope of honours from the Roman court. Very curious is his opinion of one of the former defenders of the Latin doctrine, Nicetas of Thessalonica, who nevertheless deemed the addition to the Creed an unjust one. He avowed, wrote Bessarion, the conclusion a just one, (i. e., that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the SON,) but disputed, we may say, about *an ass's shadow*, asserting that even what is true ought not to be added to the Creed. A proof of deep religious feeling and wisdom! Does the irony of his words testify to his love of truth? But this is exactly what he wrote in his letter to Alexis Lascaris, in which he explains his motives for agreeing with the Latins.¹ Isidore himself remarked to John the Provincial, during the last sitting, that his arguments, to which no answer was given, do not give him the right of claiming a victory over the Greeks; and notwithstanding, immediately after the close of the session, was the first to vote for the Latins. Plainly enough, in this case also, it was not persuasion in the truth that impelled Isidore to act as he did, but wishes and hopes similar to those nourished by Bessarion. As to *Gregory*, who afterwards ascended the throne of the miserable Patriarch Joseph, this is what he says of himself in moments of sincerity: "I know that, if we join the Latin Church, we shall be cursed, yes, even before we get to Venice; if even we do not join, we shall still be cursed. At all events, it is better to join, and then bear the curse."² Such were the persons surrounding John!

When those who were displeased at the turn affairs

¹ Allat. de perpet. consens. pp. 705, 980.

² Syr. ix. 5.

had taken asked the Emperor's leave to return home, he would not allow any one to go out of the town,¹ accused them of pusillanimity, of indifference towards the general good ; threatened them with his anger.² In the private meetings he pointed out to the Greeks the advantage of concluding peace, referred to his own labours, the example of former times ; at one time asking civil officials to the council and demanding their opinions, at other times prohibiting them to vote.

In the meantime the Pope, instead of all the comforts promised by him to the Greeks, kept them longer than he did at Ferrara waiting for the promised help. Ever since their arrival at Florence, (Feb. 8,) they had not received a penny till the 22nd of May,³ and then only two months' allowance was paid them. The rest of the money was paid down after the last decree on the union was signed.⁴ Christopher, the distributor of the Papal largesse, even had the impudence to order that nothing should be given to Mark of Ephesus. "He eats the Pope's bread," said Christopher, "and opposes the Pope."⁵

Such was the condition of the Greeks, when the means of bringing about an union with the Church of Rome were being discussed. The notice given by the Pope was very short.⁶ On Monday in Holy Week (March 30), the Emperor summoned a council in the apartments of the invalid Patriarch. Before it

¹ Syr. viii. 4.

² Syr. viii. 7 ; ix. 1.

³ Syr. viii. 6 ; ix. 2. 1,208 florins were given for two months.

⁴ Syr. x. 3, 17.

⁵ Syr. ix. 2.

⁶ Not more than twelve days had elapsed since the last Council sitting (March 24) till Easter (April 5).

took place, the Greeks looked over the books referred to by the Latins.¹ As soon as the discussion about the union commenced, Isidore of Russia was the first to give in his vote. "It is better," said he, "to join the Latins heart and soul, than to return without having finished the work in hand. Of course we can return, but how to return—whither—when?" Besarion defended Isidore's opinion. But Dositheus of Monemvasia, Vicar of the throne of Jerusalem, replied with warmth, "What is it you want to do? To return home at the Pope's expense, and turn false to our doctrine? I would sooner consent to die, than receive the Latin faith." Isidore tried to persuade him, that not only the Western but the Eastern Fathers admit the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON. Anthony of Heraclea, Vicar of the Alexandrian throne, objected, that the Councils and all the Greek Fathers teach that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER alone. But Mark, daring more than the rest, proclaimed that the Latins were not only schismatics, but heretics. "Our Church," said Mark, "has kept silence on this, because the Latins are more powerful and numerous than we are; but we, in fact, have broken all ties with them, for the very reason that they are heretics.² Peace with them can be renewed only on their rejecting the addition to the Creed, and receiving our doctrine on

¹ Syn. Flor. p. 562.

² Michael, Patriarch of Constantinople towards the end of the twelfth century, writes: "It would be just to anathematise the Latins, and call them heretics. But the Orthodox Fathers have mitigated the sentence; they have only cut off and abjured the Latins, but have not openly declared them heretics, neither have they adjudged them to the same punishment with heretics." Allat. de consens. Eccl. p. 617.

the procession of the HOLY GHOST." "How, then, wilt thou answer the testimonies of the Latin Fathers adduced by the Latins?" asked the Emperor. Mark answered, "I am not certain whether they really are the words of holy Fathers. We have none of their writings." Afterwards, while speaking on the same subject, Mark added, "that the *Latin testimonies of the Fathers* must be compared with the testimony of Maximus the Confessor on the belief of the Church of Rome, and also with the testimonies of the *Œcumenical Councils*."¹

Thus, even at the very commencement of discussions on the union, a division took place between the parties discussing! Three Vicars of three Eastern Patriarchates stood firmly for Orthodoxy. They were joined by other bishops, though not all, and even by some of the civil officials surrounding the Emperor.

During Holy Week and Easter the Greeks had three more assemblies on the same subject, and with the same success. Some sided with Bessarion and Isidore, as, for instance, Dorotheus of Mitylene, who from this time became a strenuous upholder of the union.² But the Orthodox side was stronger than the opposition. This is why the Emperor, on Friday in Easter Week, (April 10,) sent to tell the Pope that the Greeks would no longer continue the disputes, and could

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 563, 568. Syr. viii. 2.

² It is true that Dorotheus mentions that, during the third assembly in the Patriarch's apartments, all had nearly agreed to his proposal of union with the Latins, on the foundation of the testimonies of the Latin Fathers, and the words of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople. But this is contradicted by the circumstance of the Emperor's afterwards asking the Pope to point out some means of reconciliation. Syn. Flor. p. 569.

find no means for a reconciliation : " If you can think of any means, tell us ; but we have said, and say, that the doctrine taught by us is the tradition of the Fathers and the Ecumenical Councils."¹

The Pope requested the Greeks to state their misunderstandings on the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and to hear an answer to them by the Latin divines ; " or else if you wish," said the Pope, " let every one before the Gospel, or before the Blood and Body of CHRIST frankly divulge his opinions : and then, what shall be found just by the majority, shall be universally received." But to agree to the first proposition was the same thing as recommencing the disputes. The last part of the proposal seemed to be something out of the common, as it was never heard of at the former Councils. Thus on the same day, the Emperor and the Council of the Greeks, having refused the first proposition renewed their demands for other means to bring about the union.²

The Pope promised to send his Cardinals to speak on this subject with the Greeks. In expectation of these counsellors, Bessarion of Nicæa and George Scholarius presented to the Greek assembly their own opinions upon the subject of dispute between the Greeks and Latins, and on the present position of Greek affairs. Bessarion began his long speech by saying, that Eastern and Western Bishops being led by one and the same SPIRIT cannot contradict each other, and concluded from this, that when contradictions are to be met with in their writings, they must be reconciled, by determining

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 566, 569. Syr. viii. 2. Syropulus refers only to those assemblies which were held in the Emperor's presence.

² Synod. Flor. pp. 569, 574. Syr. viii. 8.

the sense of obscure passages by those more clear. But, among the Western Fathers, continued Bessarion, we find many plain allusions made of the SPIRIT'S procession from the SON. The Eastern Fathers sometimes say, that the HOLY GHOST appears, emanates, proceeds from the FATHER through the SON, is the Spirit of Both, is from the SON. All these expressions, concluded Bessarion, must be understood as agreeable to the doctrine, contained, as he thought, in the writings of the Latin Fathers and Church Teachers. Their very words he did not quote, deeming, as he affirmed, what was said at the Council satisfactory; though referring to the arguments made use of by Mark of Ephesus, he did not examine or refute them, and used a very strange method of reconciling the contradictions between the Easterns and Westerns. For if no one doubts, that the Fathers of the Eastern Church were the teachers of the Western Fathers, if the former are superior both in age and learning, and on account of their labours in the developments of the doctrine of faith, then evidently it is not the Eastern Fathers are to be explained by the Latin ones, but *vice versâ*. Bessarion even blamed Mark for not answering some of the Latin questions at the Council.¹ Scholarius' speeches, even if they have not come down to us in their original form, as the Latins themselves avow, contained exhortations for peace to be founded not on any interested motives, but on truth

¹ Syn. Flor. t. ii. pp. 187, 274. In order to understand rightly the passages taken by Bessarion from the writings of the Fathers of the Eastern Church, we must refer our readers to Adam Zoernikoff's work. There the author proves, that the Western Fathers of the first eight centuries taught agreeably with the Eastern that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER alone. Tractatus iv.

universally acknowledged; they also pointed out the means of doing away with the objections against the truth's open confession, and to some of the means of defining it.¹

On the 15th of April three Cardinals, with several Bishops and Abbots came to the Council from the Pope. Cardinal Julian spent two hours in trying to prove to the Emperor the necessity of recommencing the discussions. The Emperor would not comply. After several disputes on this subject, it was agreed to appoint a committee of twenty members, ten from each side, to lay down the doctrine of the HOLY GHOST's procession in such a form, as might be received both by the Latins and the Greeks. The members of the committee were to assemble in the Papal palace, and each of them in turn was to give his opinion in the course of eight sittings.

On receiving the Pope's assent to this discussion, the Emperor appointed Anthony of Heraclea, Mark, Isidore, Dositheus of Monemvasia, Bessarion, and others, as members of the committee; and himself was present also during its sittings. It was hard to suppose that the committee would agree in the choice of the means for a reconciliation, after disagreeing with each other on dogmatical principles. Bessarion proposed, that the same expressions should be used which had been formerly used by Maximus the Confessor, in his epistle to Marinus, to explain the Latin doctrine on the proces-

¹ We mean the three speeches ascribed to George Scholarius, and usually found in the Appendix to the acts of the Council of Florence, in the form of one entire speech. *Syn. Flor.* t. ii. pp. 28—186. As to the epistle preceding the speeches, also ascribed to Scholarius, it is evidently not authentic. Vide on this the Dissertation of Renaudot, de Gennadio Scholar. in *Fabr. Bibl. Græc. Ed. Harles.* xi. p. 364 and 371.

sion. But the Latins found that these words contained a meaning directly contrary to the doctrine of the Eastern Church. Others adduced as an example the epistle of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, where it was said that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER through the SON. But the Latins on getting to know that the Greeks distinguish *διὰ* from *ἐκ*, objected to these expressions. Mark, always true to his persuasion, said on this occasion: "Let the Latins do away with the addition made by them to the Creed, and then the union of Churches can take place."¹

But the Latins would not even listen to this proposition. Thus, the sittings of the committee were spent in vain disputes, so that the Greeks after two meetings refused to come any more to the Papal palace. The Latins however obliged them to attend three more meetings, which as usual were without any result.²

Soon after, the Latins sent their own formula or exposition of the subject disputed to the Greeks. They proposed, that both parties should explain their doctrine in the following form: "We Greeks do proclaim that, though we admit the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER, still we do not deny that the HOLY GHOST proceeds and receives from the SON, as from the FATHER; but forasmuch as we have heard that the Latins avow the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER and the SON, as from two principles,

¹ Afterwards, when Bessarion began to slander Mark, as consenting to the Latin doctrine, and only demanding the rejection of the addition to the Creed,—Mark gave an explanation quite contrary to this idea. Syrop. viii. 16.

² Synod. Flor. 580—583. Syrop. viii. 11, 12.

for this very reason have we avoided this expression. But we Latins do affirm that, though we avow the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER and the SON, still we do not deny that the FATHER is the source and origin of all Divinity, i.e., the SON and the HOLY GHOST; in like manner, avowing the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON, we do not deny that the SON has this from the FATHER, and do not admit two principles or two proceedings of the HOLY GHOST, but one origin and one procession."¹ Two days later the Latins sent in their exposition of the dogma also.

When this exposition was read before the Council of Greek Bishops, it was indignantly rejected by nearly all of them, excepting the real apostates of orthodoxy, such as Isidore, Bessarion, Dorotheus of Mitylene, Gregory the almoner: "How are we to receive," said the orthodox, "this exposition directly contrary to the doctrine of our Church?" The Latin partizan Bessarion again took up his favourite theme, and endeavoured to prove that the expressions found in the works of the Greek Fathers, such as—*through the Son*, are quite identical with the Latin *from the Son*, i.e., that the SON is the cause of the procession of the HOLY GHOST as well as the FATHER, though the Latins themselves, as we have seen above, did not look upon these expressions as identical. Mark of Ephesus opposed to Bessarion the words of S. John Chrysostom, who, admitting the procession of the

¹ Syropulus most likely quotes both this act and the Greek answer in their original form, and in the Hist. of the Florentine Council only as an epitome. Besides this Syropulus mentions the Latin objections to the Greek answer. The authenticity of these acts in Syropulus is received by Le Quien. Dissertat. Damasc. i. 27.

SPIRIT through the SON, at the same time denies His procession from the SON: and for this reason does not admit, that the SON is the cause of the HOLY GHOST.

This is what S. John says: Πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὡς ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεῦμα, οὐκ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. Μόνος γὰρ αἴτιος ὁ Πατήρ.¹

More than one sitting was spent in unnecessary discussions on the ἐκ and διά. At last the Emperor reminded the assembly that an answer must be given to the Latins. *Isidore* proposed that the treatise on the Greek doctrine contained in the exposition sent by the Latins, should be filled up with expressions found in the writings of the Greek Fathers, and more agreeable to the Latin doctrine. With this in view, he read several passages from the work of one Latinizing Patriarch, John Veccus, passages interpolated and wrongly explained by an upholder of the Church of Rome.² Two such passages were chosen: one from the acts of the first Œcumenical Council, compiled by Gelasius of Cyzicum; the other from the works of S. Cyril of Alexandria. The first, if read in the form given to it by Veccus, stands thus: "*The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, but is as His own to the Son, and overflows (ἀναβλύζον) from Him.*"³ The second passage reads as

¹ De Fide Orthod. Lib. i. cap. xii. Ed. Le Quien. p. 148.

² This work is called: Ἐπιγραφαί. It is printed by Allatius in the Græc. Orthodoxa. t. ii. p. 522. The passages alluded to are found in the beginning of the book, p. 525, 526.

³ Τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκπορευόμενον μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, Υἱὸν δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀναβλύζον. In the acts of the Council of Nice this passage stands thus: Ἐκπορευόμενον μὲν τοῦ Πατρὸς, Υἱὸν δὲ ὃν τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Ὅτι δὲ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἡμῖν ἀναβλύζον ἐστὶ, σαφέστατα ἐν εὐαγγελίοις ἐδίδαξεν αὐτὸς ὁ

follows: "*The Spirit essentially flows from Both, that is, from the Father through the Son.*"¹ When rightly understood, with the words ἀναβλύζον and ἐκπορευόμενον taken in the sense of temporal mission, these passages can be received by the Orthodox: thus, when the Emperor demanded the general opinion on these passages, many declared their assent to the doctrine contained in them. But all these expressions lacked dogmatical accuracy, and this was why the defenders of orthodoxy were little content with them. Notwithstanding this, the Emperor ordered that the Greek doctrine on the HOLY GHOST should be expounded, and drawn up in expressions received by the majority. His orders were executed by Scholarius.

In the exposition presented, the passage about the Latin doctrine remained as before; but the Greek doctrine was expressed in the very words of the above mentioned expressions, thus: "We Greeks do believe and confess, that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER, but is as His own to the SON and flows out (ἀναβλύζον) from Him; we also affirm and believe that He essentially flows from both, that is, from the FATHER and through the SON." Thus, in this formula, the Latin and the Greek party each retained its own doctrine, without rejecting the contrary opinion. On the formula being read before the Greek Council, the Emperor again demanded to know the general opinion

Κόριος . . . Thus ἀναβλύζον does not imply the eternal procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON, but His mission to us. Veccus omittit ἡμῖν. See Zoernikoff in the Greek translation. T. i. p. 218, 219.

¹ Lib. i. de adoratione, p. 9. See the explanation of this passage in Zoernikoff. Tract. p. 836.

on it, and also sent to know the Patriarch's opinion, who was then absent on account of his illness. Many approved this exposition of faith, and the Patriarch also, at least as the messengers said, gave in his vote for it. But the three Vicars of the Eastern Patriarchates, Anthony, Mark, and Dositheus, and with them several Bishops, and Syropulus, rejected it. Anthony of Heraclea reminded the Emperor, that he himself at the commencement of the Florentine session had left the Greeks the right of recommencing the discussions on the addition to the Creed, whereas now he had given up everything to the Latins. Dositheus implored the Emperor to be more careful in what he did regarding the faith, and pointed out the miserable example of Michael Palæologus. But John would listen to nothing, and in order to increase the number of votes favourable to the formula, ordered votes to be taken from the reporters present at the Council, at the proposal of the Metropolitan of Lacedæmon and contrary to all rules. Thus a majority of twenty-one against twelve passed the exposition of faith, compiled to please the Latins, and given over to the Cardinals in the beginning of May.¹

The Latin party present at the Council deemed this victory a very valuable one. But the Latins were not content with this twofold exposition of faith, and a short time afterwards sent in twelve remarks on the Greek confession of faith. One of these remarks was, that the expressions *ἐκπορευόμενον* and *ἀναβλύζον* have a double meaning, and can be referred to the temporal

¹ According to our Russian memoirs, this last assembly took place on the 2nd of May. Ant. Biblioth. t. vi. treatise 42.

mission of the HOLY GHOST from the SON, and consequently demanded, that the Greeks should either receive the Latin formula of confession or correct their own exposition of faith, changing the obscure and indefinite expressions in it. The Emperor did not show these remarks to the Bishops, but only mentioned, that the Latins demanded some explanations to several of the expressions in the Greek confession of faith.¹

For a long time afterwards, it seemed, that all efforts for a reconciliation with the Latins would remain fruitless. The Bishops who had consented to the exposition sent in by the Latins, now showed evident signs of discontentment. "What else do the Latins require from us?" said they. "We wrote and presented our confession of faith in expressions used by the Fathers. We can do nothing more." Dull from inactivity, and pressed by want, the Greeks began asking the Emperor's leave to return home; but he kept them. The meetings following were spent in the former discussions on the *ἐκ* and *διὰ*, on the authenticity or not of the Latin testimonies. But all these discussions were ever without any results, but those of mutual anger. Anthony of Heraclea, an old man, who had not received a learned education, but was notwithstanding a warm defender of Orthodoxy, and Mark of Ephesus were continually affronted by their Latinizing brethren. Once even Bessarion publicly declared, that Mark was held by an evil spirit, while Dorotheus, with Methodius of Lacedæmon threatened to tell the Pope, that Mark looks upon the Roman Pontiff as a heretic. Anthony and Mark approved the objections of Nilus Cavasilas

¹ Syr. viii. 13, 16; Synod. Flor. pp. 583—588.

against the Latin subtleties ; but Gregory the Confessor, and Isidore of Russia, called Nilus a schismatic, and bade Mark first curse him and then adduce his testimonies.

In the mean time the Latins were still expecting an answer to their remarks. But the Emperor would not answer. During an interview with the Pope he said : "If you receive our confession of faith, then let the union come to pass. If not, we will return to Constantinople." At another time, in reply to some reproofs made by the Pope on his inactivity, he said : "Of course we ought to have given an explanation of our confession of faith ; but the *most part* of our Bishops are in doubt of what is demanded of them, some through ignorance, others because they cannot reject the doctrine received from the Fathers." At last the Pope persuaded the Emperor to send the Greek Bishops to his palace, intending to have a personal interview with them.

On the 27th of May the Bishops came. Receiving them in the presence of nine Cardinals, the Pope reminded them of his efforts and earnest desire for the union of Churches, at the same time turning their attention to their slowness in performing his wishes both at Ferrara and Florence ; he threatened to leave them helpless if they did not bestir themselves to join the Church of Rome, and bade them hope for aid from the Christian monarchs in case of the union taking place. Who knows, but that other more private and pleasant promises were made by this principal upholder of the union ?

At all events, soon after this Papal exhortation,

Isidore and *Bessarion*, together with the Metropolitans of Lacedæmon and Mitylene, came to the Emperor, and positively told him, that, "if he does not wish for the union, they will unite without him." This declaration made a very strong impression on the Emperor, so much so, that he ordered the Bishops to assemble for a discussion. ¹On the 28th of May² the Emperor opened the meeting with a speech, in which he represented the necessity of peace for the Churches, advising his hearers at the same time to be very circumspect in an alliance with the Church of Rome. The Bishops then anathematized all averse to the union. Then, at the demand of the Patriarch, were read those passages from S. Epiphanius and S. Cyril of Alexandria, in which the Latinizing party thought they could see the consent of these Fathers to the doctrine of Rome; these passages were easily found in the same works of Veccus, from which they had been before extracted. Repeating one passage after the other, without the beginning or end, without even connecting them, Bessarion concluded: "so say the saints in many places!" Dorotheus then read the testimonies of the Latin Fathers.

On the next day, the reading of the Fathers of the Eastern Church was continued, namely, S. Athanasius,

¹ Syn. Flor. p. 589—601; Syr. ix. 1, 6. In the History of the Council of Florence, many meetings held between the 2nd and 28th of May are not mentioned. But Syropulus speaks of them, though he, in his turn says nothing about the Papal address to the Bishops.

² In mentioning the details of this and the subsequent meetings, in which the union with the Church of Rome was decided upon we are principally guided by Syropulus. Dorotheus' history is evidently partial to the Latins. Both narratives however agree pretty well in essential points.

Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, Anastasius the Sinaite, John Damascene, and the conclusion made was, that all these Fathers admit the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the SON.¹

On the third day (May 30) votes were collected in favour of the Latin doctrine. The Bishops asked the Patriarch to vote the first. Joseph was loth to consent. At last he gave in his vote, but his very vote was so capable of two meanings, that many thought that he rejected the Latin doctrine. Then followed the votes of the Bishops and Hegumens. Out of twenty-seven present, ten voted for the union: seventeen against it. Among those who would not consent to it, were the three Patriarchal Vicars, Mark of Ephesus, Anthony of Heraclea, and Dositheus of Monemvasia; the Metropolitans of Trebizond, Cyzicum, Tornovo, Moldovlachia, Amasea, Melenicus, Drama, Drystra, and Anchialus. Thus it seems that most of the Bishops were not persuaded by the lengthened readings of Bessarion and his party. The Chartophylax, Ecclesiarch, and other persons in the Patriarch's service (among whom were many strenuous opponents of the union) were not even asked for their opinions, and were also prohibited voting in the Council, under the plea of their being a degree lower than the Hegumens. The Emperor even wished to hear the opinion of the civil officials in his suite, but was opposed in this by the Patriarch.

¹ Neither Syropulus nor Dorotheus mention what were the very words taken from the writings of any of these Fathers. This is why we cannot show here, how partial was the rendering of the passages, in which nothing at all was said to the advantage of the Latins. A list of these passages may be seen in Zoernikoff.

The Latinizing party, seeing how few were the votes for the union, betook themselves to other means. The Patriarch was persuaded to invite some of the opposing Bishops to his palace and there to entice them to the union. Isidore of Russia even proposed to cut off the disobedient from the Church; but the Patriarch rejected his plan as one which would be of no good to the union. Instead of this, Joseph invited the Metropolitans of Moldovlachia, Tornovo, and Amasea to his palace, and there reproved them gently on their ingratitude and disobedience. "Why do you not listen to me?" said Joseph. "Was it not from my cell that you came out? Was it not I who raised you to the rank of Bishops? Why then do you betray me? Why did you not second my opinion? Think you, then, you can judge better than others about dogmas? I know, as well as anybody else, what the Fathers taught." The Bishops replied that, disagreeing with the Latins in the disputed doctrine, they thought of expressing the opinion of the Patriarch himself, understanding his words in the sense of a refusal to admit the Latin doctrine. But the Patriarch, in his turn, noticed that they had better have entered into the real meaning of his words, and expressed more clearly what they had heard rather obscurely. When dismissing them, Joseph advised them to follow his opinion, which he promised to explain more fully in the following sitting. The Patriarch also had an interview with Mark, and intreated him in the name of all the Saints, and for the sake of his father's memory, to agree to the union with the Church of Rome. But this venerable man remained firm against all entreaties. He had already been asked to agree to union, even if it

were apparently for the sake of others. His answer was: "In deeds of faith there must be no concessions, no waverings." And when the difference between the two confessions was shown as insignificant, Mark answered: "You speak just like the prefect, who intreated Theodorus to receive heretics into communion only once, and then to act as he liked." The saint answered: "Thy request is like, as if a person said, Allow me to cut your head off, and then you may go wherever you like."¹ Following up this example, Mark remained firm to the end.

At the same time, the Emperor by means of various promises had managed to gain over to his cause several of the Bishops, and the envoys from Trebizond and Moldovlachia, and even made the Metropolitan of Cyzicum waver, by making him a present of some land he had been longing for. Isidore, in the meantime, prepared a splendid repast for the Metropolitans of Melenicus, Drystra, Drama, and some others, and at table obtained their consent to the union.

While guaranteeing his success in reconciling the Greeks to an union with the Church of Rome, the Emperor wished also to make himself certain of the Pope's aid, should the union take place. Isidore, sent by him to the Pope on this business, returned with three Cardinals, who, in the Pope's name, assured him that the Pope (a) agrees to pay the return voyage of the Greeks; (b) promises to keep three hundred soldiers at Constantinople, and two galleys in the Bosphorus, at his own expense; (c) agrees to enforce it as a duty that all pilgrims to the East should call at Constantinople; (d)

¹ Syr. ix. 6.

in case of great necessity is ready to send the Emperor twenty galleys for half a year's time, or ten galleys for a year; (e) and lastly, if need be, will try to invite the European monarchs to give their aid to the Greek Empire by means of their land forces.

After these preliminaries, the Emperor convoked a second meeting (2nd of June)¹ to make a final decision as to the admission of the Latin dogma and the union with the Church of Rome. In this meeting the Patriarch was the first to give his opinion, which, if it has come down to us rightly, was as follows: "I will not change, and never will I reject our doctrine handed down by the Fathers, but will sustain it till my last breath. But, whereas the Latins do avow the Procession of the Most HOLY SPIRIT from the SON, not of their own accord, but on the foundation of Holy Scripture, therefore do I also agree with them, expressing by the preposition *διὰ*, that the SON is the Cause, and therefore also do I join and enter into union with them."

The Patriarch afterwards made a written declaration of his opinion, viz.: "Whereas we have heard the words of the Holy Eastern and Western Fathers, of whom some say, that the SON proceeds from the FATHER and the SON; and others, from the FATHER through the SON; therefore, as the expression, '*through the SON,*' is equivalent to '*from the SON,*' and vice versâ,—we, omitting the expression, *from the Son,* say, that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the FATHER through the SON ever and essentially, as from One Principle and Cause, using '*διὰ*' to express the cause of the HOLY

¹ Syr. ix. 9. Vide History of the Council of Florence, June 3rd.

GHOST'S Procession."¹ Having explained his opinion, the Patriarch made another remark, that the Latins should not demand the insertion of the Filioque clause into the Greek Creed. After the Patriarch, the Vicars of the Eastern Patriarchates, and the other Metropolitans and Hegumens, gave in their opinions. The union party rapidly increased. Only three Patriarchal Vicars—Mark of Ephesus, Anthony of Heraclea, and Dositheus of Monemvasia, together with Sophronius, Metropolitan of Anchialus, remained steadfastly true to the Orthodox doctrine. Dositheus of Trebizond, who was not present at the Council on account of illness, gave no opinion at all, notwithstanding his opinion was very much demanded. The Emperor's brother, Demetrius, also refused to give in his vote, under the plea, that he was not well informed on this affair, and was loth to meddle in it. Ten days afterwards he left the Council. The Emperor refusing to allow the Clergy occupying different offices round the Patriarch to give their votes, nevertheless demanded the opinions of his own civil officers, not excepting the Lord of the bed-chamber. All of them agreed to the union; so did also the envoys of Moldovlachia, Trebizond, and Peloponnesus. The Georgian envoys, both Bishop and civilian, had already left Florence, as soon as they guessed the Emperor's plan of union with the Church of Rome.

¹ Syropulus says plainly that the Patriarch's opinion was mostly thus written down, ix. 9. In the History of the Council of Florence it is also quoted word for word, being a proof of Syropulus' testimony, that this opinion was written down. We have reasons to think that Syropulus is more correct in referring this circumstance to the present sitting rather than to the former ones.

At last, the Emperor himself gave his opinion to the Council. He said, that looking upon this Council as Œcumenical, he would abide by its decision, and that of the majority of its members, and is ready to defend its decision. Thus, the first foundation for the union with the Church of Rome was confirmed by the decree of the Council.¹

¹ Syr. ix. 12; Syn. Flor. pp. 601—620. We will give our readers some details of this sorrowful event, quoting the very words of the venerable Mark of Ephesus. In his Epistle “on the Florentine Council,” he writes: “The traitors to their own salvation were not content till they obtained a public confession of the Latin Creed in an assembly convoked and honoured by the presence of the Emperor, Patriarch, and Despot. Adducing passages from the works of the Western Teachers and the great S. Cyril, apparently favourable to Latinism, and after having before this attacked me one by one with their sophistries, they then asked the members present at the Council what they thought of the adduced passages, and whether they avow the SON a Cause of the HOLY GHOST. The members answered that they did not doubt the authenticity of these passages, relying on the Epistle of the divine Maximus; but most of the members refused to admit the SON as the Cause of the SPIRIT (according to these passages) because the wise Maximus also gives the same opinion of these passages. But those who dared to say anything bad, tempted by different boastful promises, would listen to no one, and declared that the SON is the Cause of the HOLY GHOST,—an idea not even mentioned in the Latin quotations. Their words were confirmed by the miserable Patriarch, who was formerly favourable to them, and was now impatiently awaiting his liberty, but vainly, for his lot was death. I had written *my* opinion, or confession of faith, for it was agreed that every one should give in his opinion in writing. But when I saw that they were very warm for the union, and that my former companions fell into the same error with them, and that all had forgotten to write down their opinions, I kept my writing to myself, fearing lest I should myself fall into danger by provoking their anger. But I boldly explained my opinion in words, and showed that the words of the Eastern, and Western Fathers can only be reconciled to each other by means of the explanation given them in the Epistle of Maximus, i.e.,

Before closing the assembly, the Emperor declared, that as the Council approves the doctrine of the Latin Church, and wishes for an union with it, all contradiction of the Council decree is prohibited, as well as every renewal of the controversy, under pain of severe punishment; and immediately gave orders to his guards to look after the peace of the members of the Council.¹ The opinions of the Bishops were written down. An extract was made from all these opinions, in which it was said: "We believe that the HOLY GHOST is ever and essentially from the FATHER and the SON, ever and essentially proceeds from the FATHER through the SON." This definition was written down in three copies, one of which was taken by the Emperor, another by the Patriarch, and the third was presented to the Pope. But even the new confession drawn up by the Greeks was not entirely approved by the Latins. The Cardinals demanded that the words, "*through the Son*" should be omitted in the confession. The Greeks disputed a long while about this; but, at the desire of the Latins, were at last obliged to change these expressions. The confession was re-written, presented to the Pope, and approved by him. On the 8th of June, the confession was read in the presence of the Pope, in Greek and in Latin. As

that the SON must not be thought the Cause of the SPIRIT. Besides this, I noticed, with regard to the addition, that I did not approve of it in the Latin Creed, as being an addition made without sufficient reason. After this, they continued their business; and I leaving them to themselves, kept and keep away from everything, in order to consecrate all my time to the Holy Fathers and Teachers." This letter is adduced in extracts in the answer given to it by Joseph Metho. Syn. Flor. t. xi. pp. 345—357.

¹ Syr. ix. 13.

a sign of the approach of the times of peace, between the Churches, the Latins gave the Greeks the kiss of love.¹

CHAPTER VIII.

DISPUTES ON OTHER LATIN DOCTRINES. DEATH OF THE PATRIARCH. PROCLAMATION OF THE UNION OF CHURCHES.

The kiss given by the Latins was not a brotherly, sincere kiss of reconciled Christians. The Pope having forced the Greeks into a consent to the Latin doctrine on the HOLY GHOST, wished moreover, that they should admit the other new doctrines of the Church of Rome, until then ever rejected by the Easterns. He said to Isidore, Bessarion, and the Metropolitans of Trebizond and Mitylene, who had been sent to him by the Emperor (June 9): "We have now by God's grace, come to an agreement on the disputed dogma. It still remains for us to define the doctrine on Purgatory, on the authority of the Papal throne, on the bread in the Eucharist, and on the consecration of the Host. Then every reason for disagreement will be done away with. Let us then finish our business, which can bear no procrastination."

The Bishops immediately gave their explanation to the Pope's proposal. With regard to the bread in the Eucharist, they prevailed on the Pope to admit of the validity of the Eucharist, whether performed in leavened or unleavened bread. In answer to the question on Purgatory, they said: "We confess, that the souls of

¹ Syn. Flor. pp. 621—624.

good men receive the full reward, and those of sinners full punishment, whereas those in a middle condition are subjected to agonies in prison; but what is the exact cause of their agonies, whether it be fire, or darkness, or anything else, we cannot positively affirm." With respect to the Pope's authority, they answered, that the Pontiff of ancient Rome ought to retain the rights he had before the division of Churches. As to the consecration of the Host in the Eucharist, the Greeks admitted, contrary to the doctrine of old, that at the pronunciation of our SAVIOUR's words: "Take, eat," &c., the bread and wine are immediately transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of CHRIST, and said, that the prayer following this, in the Greek Liturgiaron has reference only to the communicants. In this prayer—said the apostates from Orthodoxy, quite contrary to its real meaning—we beseech, that the HOLY GHOST¹ should descend upon the communicants, and should in them make the bread and wine the Body and Blood of CHRIST, so that the consecrated Host in the Sacrament might cleanse their souls, to the forgiveness of their sins, and not to judgment or condemnation. The Greeks were also required to give an explanation *περὶ θείας οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας*, a doctrine upon which Mark would not say a word at the Council. Even now the Bishops would not give the desired explanation.²

The Pope not quite satisfied with the explanations given by the Bishops, and wishing for a written answer from the Greek Council, set down his demands more clearly in writing (the next day, June 10). He wished

¹ See note at the end of the chapter.

² Syn. Flor. p. 620—626.

the Greeks to admit all the privileges of the Pope as the Vicar of JESUS CHRIST and Supreme Pontiff, and that they should consequently admit the justice of the addition to the Creed, as one approved of by the Pope himself; that they should admit the doctrine on Purgatory, and generally speaking on the condition of souls after death, in the very same terms in which it was held by the Church of Rome; and lastly, that they should examine the doctrine on the Divine essence and action (περὶ θείας οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας). The Pope on his part agreed to admit the validity of the Eucharist when performed in leavened bread. But the Bishops, afraid of fresh disputes, refused to bring a written exposition of the Papal demands, and only verbally informed the Emperor and Patriarch of them. This was before noon.

In the evening of the same day, it became known, that *the Patriarch Joseph was dead*. According to Dorotheus's History, it seems, that when all had assembled in the Patriarch's apartments, they were told by the servants, that the Patriarch had retired to his bedroom, as he was wont to do after his evening meal, and had sat down to write there, but suddenly feeling a sudden agitation, died. The Greeks took the last will of the Patriarch, and found the following to be its contents: "Joseph, by God's grace Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Œcumenical Patriarch. Whereas I have attained the limits of my life, and shall soon have to pay the universal tribute: I do now with God's help announce my opinion to all my children. I do myself confess and agree to everything held and taught by the Catholic and Apos-

tolie Church of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the senior Rome. I avow the Pope of the elder Rome, to be the blessed Father of Fathers, the Supreme Pontiff and Vicar of CHRIST. I certify this before all. I admit the Purgatory of souls. In assurance of which it is signed, June 9, indict the 2nd, 1439 year.”¹

Such is the strange description left to us of the Patriarch’s death and his last will, in the history of Dorotheus! There are reasons however for doubting the truth of this narrative. It is evident from the history of Dorotheus, that the Patriarch died on the 10th of June. For, describing the events of the last week spent by the Greeks in Florence, day by day, he says plainly, that, (a) the Greek exposition of the doctrine on the HOLY GHOST was received by the Pope on Monday, the 8th of June (τῇ δευτέρᾳ, ἰουνίου ὁγδόῃ); (β) that on the Tuesday, he, Dorotheus, himself visited the Pope, as did the other Bishops also; (γ) that, on Wednesday (τῇ τετάρτῃ) he was again with the Pope and heard his last demands, which were afterwards stated to the Emperor and the Patriarch (ἅπαντα εἶπομεν αὐτῷ, the Emperor, ὁμοίως καὶ τῷ Πατριάρχῃ). Immediately after this Dorotheus adds: ἐσπέρας οὖν ἄφνω μῆνυμα ἦλθεν ἡμῖν, τῇ αὐτῇ τετάρτῃ, λέγον, ὅτι Πατριάρχης ἀπίθανε, i.e., in the evening on the same Wednesday we received the report of the Patriarch’s death.

Thus, plainly enough, the Patriarch died on Wednesday, and this Wednesday was the 10th of June. Syropulus asserts the same. He writes: “the Patriarch died suddenly, during the evening meal, on the 10th of June, in the 2nd indict.”² The Russian memoirs on

¹ Flor. Synod. p. 627—630.

² Syr. ix. 16.

the Council refer the Patriarch's death to the 10th day of June.¹ How then is Joseph's will dated on the 9th of June? How then could Dorotheus say, that it was written by the Patriarch a very short while before his death (τὴν πρὸ μικροῦ γραφεῖσαν γνώμην)? How can the following words dated the 11th of June, belong to the Patriarch: καὶ λοιπὸν ὁ Πατριάρχης ἀπέθανεν ἐν Φλωρεντία μὴν ἰουνίῳ, ἐνάτῃ, ἰνδικτιῶνος δευτέρας? Dorotheus himself mentions having seen the Patriarch alive before dinner on the 10th. It is very evident, that the Patriarch's will and the incorrect date of his death have been introduced into Dorotheus' narrative by a later hand, and most likely at the time, when Dorotheus' history was republished: for in the Latin acts of the Council of Florence the Patriarch's death is said to have taken place on the 9th, and not the 10th of June;² whereas Dorotheus' history in its original contained neither the Patriarch's writing nor any false statements.

But, there are other reasons for doubting the authenticity of the Patriarch's last will. No one present at the Council knew anything about it. Syropulus even, does not make any mention of it. He writes: "The Patriarch said, that he would not remain long in Florence after the signing of the definition (ὅρον), and would soon take his departure. Nothing of the sort however happened, for he died and was buried before the definition was signed."³ *Gemistes Pletho* and *Amiru-*

¹ Niccon's Annals, v. 145. Stroeff's edition, part ii. § 30. In the Ancient Bibliotheca, vi. 60, the day of the month is the same, but instead of June, April is named by mistake.

² Hist. Chronolog. Patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum in Actis SS. Augusti. T. i. p. 185. n. 1119.

³ Syr. ix. 16.

tius, who were both present at the Council, say the same. *Amirutius* writes: "I affirm, that this Council is not Œcumenical, for how can it be called Œcumenical, when the Patriarch of Byzantium suddenly died before the signatures were made?"¹ Gemistes says: "No one will call the Council held in Florence Œcumenical, for the Patriarch of Byzantium did not sign its decrees on account of his sudden death." If Syropulus had known about the above-mentioned will, he would not have passed it over in silence, as silent he was not about Joseph's other weak actions. If again the Patriarch's will was known to Gemistes Pletho and Amirutius, then they would not have rejected the dignity of the Council of Florence, on account of its decree given in the month of July not being signed by the Patriarch who died in June; the more so, if in the last testamentary act supposed to have been made by him, he had really affirmed more than that which was required by the definition of faith, namely, agreed to everything taught by the Church of Rome. And what reason again was there for Joseph to give his opinion, when he was not asked for it by the Emperor or Pope, and was himself so carefully slow in acquiescing to the Papal demands? Lastly, why, in the subsequent disputes between the Latins and Greeks at the Council, is the Patriarch's last will never referred to, nor is it ever mentioned in the Council decree, that the Patriarch had, before his death, expressed his full consent to everything contained in the definition, whereas mention is made of the Patriarchal Vicars? For all these reasons an impartial history of the Council of Florence cannot look

¹ Allat. de consensu Eccles. p. 908.

upon the Patriarch's will in any other light but that of an unsuccessful forgery made by some Greek or Latin to allure the Orthodox.¹

On the next day the Patriarch was buried by the Greek Bishops in the presence of the Latin Cardinals and Bishops. His body was interred in the Church of the Holy Mother of God (S. Mariæ Novellæ), in the Dominican monastery where the Pope then resided.

The Patriarch's death apparently made a deep impression upon the Emperor. Remaining now the only support of the Greek Council, he became still more obstinate in refusing the Papal demands, though not from having been influenced by the Patriarch during his lifetime to a more decisive mode of action, neither was it from losing just then a person, who by his persuasions had dispelled the many obstacles opposing the quiet reconciliation of the Greeks with the Latins. Such persons could always be found round the Emperor; so that he was sick of their readiness to agree unconditionally to all the Papal demands. No! While Joseph was alive, the emperor looked upon him as the supreme Pastor of the Eastern Church, whose duty was to give an account to his Church of all the actions of the Greek Bishops at the Council. But now that Joseph was dead, the Emperor saw that he was himself answerable to the Church for all the intercourse held with the Pope.

¹ As far as we know, this act besides being mentioned in the History of the Council, is also found in Joseph Metho's written objection to Mark's epistle. Concil. Flor. t. ii. p. 353. Joseph lived in the second half of the fifteenth century. Fabr. Bibl. Gr. xi. Ed. Harl. p. 458. Allat. de consensu, p. 933.

On the very day of the Patriarch's funeral, the Emperor sent to the Pope asking him to bring matters to a close as soon as possible. The Pope calling Bessarion, Isidore, and Dorotheus of Mitylene, repeated the demands, the fulfilment of which was, in his opinion indispensable, for the peace of the Churches. They, as before, gave their opinion. But the Emperor was dissatisfied with this, and invited the whole of the Greek Council to discuss the new demands of the Pope (June 13). Some of the demands he would not even pay attention to, such as on purgatory and the consecration of the Host in the Eucharist. The Council was asked to decide the questions—on the wafer, on the Pope's authority, and on the addition to the Creed. The Cardinals were also invited to the Council, and they before anything else turned their attention to subjects which had been left out in the list of the subjects to be discussed in the Council, wishing to force the Greeks to their own opinions. The Emperor would not give in, so that two days passed in disputes about subjects, on which none of the Greeks wished to dispute.

At last the Pope invited the Emperor, with several Metropolitans, to his own residence, and there endeavoured to persuade them that the settling of the proposed questions must, most certainly, be introduced into the future Council-decree on the union of Churches. At the same time he made them listen to long dissertations on subjects which had not been as yet discussed in the Council. John the provincial treated on the Pope's authority, and Ambrose Traversari spoke about the consecrated wafer. "All is now settled," said the Pope at the end of the discussions; "we have only to write

the exposition of faith;" and then gave the Emperor a list of the subjects to be introduced into the definition, expecting the Greeks to give an answer to them. The Emperor would not take the papers, and only continued saying, "It is no use our talking any more; the Cardinals have said all that was wanted; it is time for us to depart." Hurt by this answer, the Pope left the assembly in great dissatisfaction. The papers were, however, taken by the Greeks.

On looking over the Papal demands at home, the principal agents in the cause of the union told the Emperor that they found the demands just and quite conformable with their own ideas.¹ But the Emperor, having before noticed the adulation paid by them to the Pope, lost all his confidence in them. In a private assembly of his Bishops he complained of the Pope and his own coadjutors.² "See what obstinate persons they are," said he of the Latins; "they always choose to have their own way. I know, however, who favours their obstinacy. If some of our own people did not encourage the Latins to be as obstinate as possible in their demands, they would not have used such great efforts to obtain our consent to all their proposals." At another time the Emperor avowed before the Bishops, "that the Greeks had already conceded to the Latins more than what was right. The Latins ought to be contented, and accomplish the union of Churches. But they care very little about peace, and only increase the number of their demands. If the Pope will not rest contented with what we have agreed to, then we have only to hire ships of the Florentines and go home."

¹ Syn. Flor. 631, 638.

² Syr. x. 3.

John, dissatisfied with the persons surrounding him, tried to win over Mark of Ephesus; commissioned him to make an exposition of the doctrine of the Eastern Church on the Eucharist;¹ and assembling those Patriarchal vicars and Metropolitans who were more inclined to the union, endeavoured by means of them to persuade this firm man to consent to the general union. But Mark valued truth beyond all things, and ever remained faithful to it.²

One question beyond the rest could not be settled agreeably to both parties,—the question *on the authority of the Pope*. The Pope once more assembled the Eastern Bishops to show them the foundation of the œcumenical rights of his throne,—rights and privileges never admitted by the East, and at that time even opposed by many in the West. While in the Pope's apartments the Bishops seemed to be persuaded in the justice of his demands; at home, after comparing what they had heard with the canons of the Church, they again retracted their consent and were quite at a loss how to agree. After various disputes they, at last, admitted all the privileges of the Papal throne, excepting the right of convoking Œcumenical Councils without the Emperor's consent, and that of judging the Patriarchs in case of complaint being lodged against them. The Pope however rejected these exceptions, declaring that he wished to retain all the privileges of his throne, such as those of receiving and examining complaints made against the Patriarchs, of convoking Councils when he found them necessary, of exacting the Patriarchs' full submission to his will; in a word, the right of governing

¹ Syr. x. 2.

² Syn. Flor. p. 539, 641.

the whole Church. When the Cardinals announced the Pope's decision to the Emperor, instead of any answer he merely said, "Make all the arrangements necessary for our departure."

This happened on the eve of the Church anniversary of the birth of S. John the Baptist. "The festival," says Dorotheus of Mitylene, "celebrated with such pomp by the Florentines was fast approaching. But we were sad at heart, seeing no prospects of an union taking place. Nevertheless," coolly continues the same writer, "God the Provider of all did not forsake us; but raised the Russian, the Nicene, and the Mitylenian, with several others, to try what they could do." Some of these persons inclined the Pope, and others prevailed upon the Emperor to agree to this last step, viz., to appoint four persons from among the Greeks and the Latins to discuss again upon the disputed subject. And though not publicly in the assembly, still the Greeks at last agreed to write, that they admitted the Pope as Supreme Pontiff, Vicar of CHRIST JESUS, Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, who governs God's Church, with the rights and privileges of the Eastern Patriarchs, so that the Patriarch of Constantinople is second to him; then comes the Patriarch of Alexandria; after him that of Antioch; and lastly, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. In this form the point was admitted by the Pope. The object of all his wishes was at length attained on the 27th of June.¹

Agreeing on the principal conditions of peace, the Latins and Greeks hastened to publish a *decree* on the union of Churches. Deputies from both sides were

¹ Syn. Flor. p. 641, 645.

chosen for this purpose. A dispute, however, arose at the very beginning of the work. The Latins wanted to place the Pope's name first in the decree. Palæologus for his part demanded his own name to be prefixed. At last it was decided to add, "with the Emperor's consent," to the Pope's words. Several expressions in the clause on the Papal authority also gave rise to some disputes. The Latins wrote: "The Pope is to retain his rights according to the doctrine of Scripture and the Holy Fathers." The Emperor insisted that this expression should be changed. "If one of the Fathers," he said, "gives the Pope an honourable title, does that mean, that he admits the special privileges of the Roman Bishop?" After many disputes, the Pope at last consented to have the expression changed, so that instead of the expression, "according to the words of the Fathers," another word was inserted, "according to the rules of the Ecumenical Councils and the Holy Fathers." The Latins also found out something in the decree which required correcting. The definition said: "retaining all the rights and privileges of the four Patriarchates." The Latins wanted the word "all," to be omitted. The Greeks would not consent to this, and the word "all" was retained. At last when both parties found nothing else in the decree wanting correction, it was finally transcribed into Greek and Latin. Isidore and Bessarion proposed that a list of anathemas should be added in the decree against all opposing the union; very likely having Mark of Ephesus in view. But the Emperor would not allow this.¹

¹ Syn. Flor. p. 647—652; Syr. x. 5. The decree was written in Latin by Ambrose Traversari and translated into Greek by Bessarion.

The day was fixed, when the signing of the decree should take place. Dorotheus of Mitylene proposed to the Pope beforehand, to bribe over some of those who had not as yet consented to the union, and bribes were in fact resorted to.¹ On the 5th of July the whole Council of the Easterns assembled in the Emperor's palace. The Emperor was the first to sign the decree. The Metropolitan of Heraclea was absent on account of his illness, but was even obliged to sign the decree in his bed. No one thought of disturbing Mark of Ephesus, being convinced of his firmness. Isidore, Bessarion, and the Protosyncellus, joyfully signed their names. Then followed the signatures of the Metropolitans of Monemvasia, Cyzicum, Trebizond, Nicomedia, Tornovo, Mitylene, Moldovlachia, Amasia, Rhodes, Drystra, Gana, Melenicus, Drama, Anchialus, and those of eleven persons from the lower grades of the Constantinopolitan clergy. The Greeks signed without reading the decree beforehand. Its contents were only known to those who had drawn it up.² At all events, most of the Greek Bishops conceding to the Pope's wish, and the Emperor's will, gave a written, though reluctant, consent to the unjust union. Even those who were not allowed to vote at the Council, were now made to sign. Exceptions were only made for those who had either died, as the Patriarch Joseph, and the Metropolitan of Sardis, or those who had managed to get away from Florence, as was done by Isaiah of Stauropol and the Bishop of Tver.³

¹ Syr. x. 4.² Syr. x. 19.³ Syr. ix. 12; x. 8. In one of the Greek manuscripts of the Moscow Synodal Library (N. xiii.) among the names signed, we do not find those of the Metropolitans of Trebizond and Cyzicum. Most likely

When all the Greek Bishops, in the presence of the Cardinals, had affixed their signatures to the Council decree, then the Emperor sent ten of the eldest Bishops to witness the signing of the decree by the Pope. Eugenius, after carefully examining the signatures of the Greek Bishops, asked while himself signed the decree, whether the Ephesian had signed? He was told that he had not. "Then nothing have we done," involuntarily exclaimed the Pope. Eight Cardinals signed their names after the Pope, about sixty Bishops, and a good many Abbots.¹

The Pope had named the 6th of July for the solemn proclamation of the union. The Emperor, Pope, with the Greek and Latin Bishops, assembled in the Cathedral Church of Florence, followed by a numerous concourse of spectators. After the Te Deum, the Cardinal Julian and the Metropolitan of Nicæa read in a loud voice the Council decree on the union of Churches. Julian read in Latin, Bessarion in Greek. In the beginning of this decree, the Pope invited the whole of the Christian world to take part in this great festival,

this omission is due to the carelessness of the transcriber. We also do not find the name of the Russian Bishop, Abram of Suzdal, who accompanied Isidore, anywhere among the Greek signatures; this is why Amirutius writes: *ὅτι τοῦ Ῥωσίου τὰς ὑπογραφὰς συνθεμένου* (Allat. de consens. p. 908.) But, in the Florentine manuscript of the Council acts Abramius' signature is met with. (Vide Sacharoff, Travels of Russians. S. Petersburg, 1837, pt. 11, page 85.) In the description of Isidore's journey it is said, that Abram was forced to sign, after having been imprisoned a whole week by Isidore. At all events, it suffices to mention, that about ten original copies of the decree are to be found in the West, whereas only five were written at the Council. Gieseler, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. ii. § 544.

¹ Syrop. x. 8, 9.

and to return grateful thanks to the LORD, Who, by His omnipotent grace, had thrown down the wall, which, until now, had separated the Churches, and had united them in the firm bonds of love and peace. Then followed the exposition of the doctrine on the Procession of the HOLY GHOST, on the Wafer, Purgatory, and the Papal authority, in expressions admitted by the mutual consent of the Greeks and Latins.

After the reading of the act, Julian asked the Latins whether they agreed to the decree. The Latins unanimously answered, "We agree, we agree." When the same question was made to the Greeks by Bessarion, many answered in the same manner, but not all. The Archbishop of Nicæa and the Cardinal then embraced each other. The festival was concluded by a Liturgy officiated according to the Latin rite,¹ in which, however, not one of the Greek Bishops would take part with the Latins, notwithstanding the Pope's wish, that they should; and none of the Greeks communicated in the wafer.²

Such was the conclusion of peace; but peace there was not. Peace was proclaimed between the Churches, and nothing peaceful was there in the spirit of the reconciled parties. Verbally, and in the decree, it was admitted, that the Holy Eucharist is alike valid whether performed on wafers or on leavened bread; but in fact the Greeks refused to receive the Sacrament from the

¹ During the Liturgy, at the time the Pope washed his hands thrice, the water was handed the second time by the Russian envoy, very likely Thomas of Tver; and this was done at Isidore's demand, from respect, as he said, to the dignity of the Russian Duke. Syr. x. 10.

² Syn. Flor. pp. 658—670.

hands of the Latins, and their kiss of peace was given to each other and not to the Latins ; and the Latins in their turn, as we shall see afterwards, refused to be present during the Greek Liturgy. The conclusion of peace was a joyful event for one party only—the victors. On leaving Constantinople, the Greeks hoped to be able to persuade the Latins of their secession from the ancient doctrine of faith. Instead of this, they were now obliged to avow the Latins in the right, and admit themselves to be in the wrong, though in reality the truth was on their side. The Latins acceded to nothing ; the Greeks were more or less obliged to accede to them in everything. The victorious party did not even try to soothe the sad feelings of their new brethren. The pride of the self-willed conqueror evinced itself in all his intercourse with the newly reconciled party.

The day after the proclamation of the decree, the Emperor sent the Metropolitans of Russia and Nicæa to invite the Pope to perform the Greek Liturgy, in order that the Latins might become acquainted with the rites and ceremonies of the Eastern Church. But the Pope refused to do so, pleading his ignorance of the order of the Greek Liturgy, and requested that the service should first be performed privately before two or three Cardinals. “ We shall then be able to see,” said the Pope, “ whether we can approve of your service, and allow the solemn performance of the Liturgy to take place.” This proud answer deeply offended the Emperor. “ We had hoped,” he said, “ to correct the errors of the Latins. And now I see, that the Latins, who have erred in many respects, wish to correct us, who have in no ways changed the ancient rules.” Since

then, the Emperor never again expressed his wish to have the Liturgy performed by the Pope.¹

Soon after this, the Pope proposed eleven questions to the Greeks, concerning the office of the Holy Eucharist, the Holy Chrism, divorces, and the election of the Patriarch. Regarded now as the head of the Church Œcumenical, he thought himself to have the right of demanding from the Greeks a strict observance of the rules of the Church of Rome. Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Mitylene, as he himself says, gave satisfactory answers to all the Latin questions, except two:—on divorces, and the election of the Patriarch. The Pope addressed these questions to the Emperor. He asked him why the Greeks allow divorces, quite contrary to the plain words of our LORD. He next demanded that the Greek Bishops should choose a Patriarch from out of the Bishops present at the Council, and that, too, before they left Florence. “We have,” said the Pope, “the Patriarch of Constantinople chosen by us from the Latins, a man of noble birth, honest, rich, and very old.”² He has not long to live. If you choose him for your Patriarch, your Church will then inherit his riches. If you have already elected one from your own, I am ready to confirm your choice, and withdraw my own candidate.” This demand was followed up by another, that Mark of Ephesus should be given up to be judged as an obstinate opponent of the union and the decree.

The Emperor answered the Pope through his Bishops,

¹ Syr. x. 11.

² This was the Cardinal Franciscus Condolmier, nephew to the Pope. Chalcedon, L. vi. p. 159; Le Quien, Or. Chr. t. iii. pp. 834, 835.

that the Eastern Church has sufficient reasons for allowing divorces; he positively refused to name a Patriarch while in Florence, for, according to the custom of old, the Patriarch of Constantinople must be elected with the consent of all the dioceses under his jurisdiction, and ordained in the Cathedral Church of Constantinople. And as to Mark of Ephesus, the Emperor said, that he, being a Metropolitan of the Eastern Church, could be judged only by Eastern Bishops.¹

But, when the Pope persisted in demanding that the election of the Patriarch should take place in Florence, and asked the Emperor to send Mark to him, to receive at least a private reprimand, John, at Gregory's advice (Gregory, the almoner, feared that Isidore would be elected Patriarch), sent off some of the eldest Metropolitans to Venice, and then told the Pope that, in the absence of some of the Bishops, the election to the Patriarchate could not take place. Mark of Ephesus came to the Pope, who met him with reproaches and threats, reminding him of the punishments appointed by the Œcumenical Councils for those who should dare to disobey their decrees. But the undaunted defender of Orthodoxy gave a decisive answer. "The Councils," said he, "sentenced those who would not obey the Church, and kept to opinions contrary to her doctrine. I express not my own opinions, I introduce nothing new into the Church, neither do I defend any errors. But I steadfastly preserve the doctrine which the Church, having received from CHRIST our SAVIOUR, has ever kept and keeps. This doctrine was also adhered to by the Church of Rome unanimously with that of

¹ Synod. Flor. pp. 670—675: Syr. x. 12.

the East, until the beginning of the division. This doctrine you yourselves have ever approved of before, and have often praised, even in the time being of this Council. And who can slander, or put down this doctrine? If I stand steadfast in this doctrine, and do not wish to reject it, who dares to judge me as a heretic? You must first judge the doctrine I defend; but if that is received unanimously as being holy and orthodox, how is it, then, that I merit judgment?" The Pope was obliged to admit inwardly that there was no hope of dissuading Mark from his opinion, and bade him depart.¹

As the Papal demands were not attended to, so also those of the Emperor remained unanswered. This can serve as an evident proof how little there was of sincerity and real desire of reconciliation in both parties with regard to the union. Though the Emperor did avow the Pope head of the Church Œcumenical, and ordered his name to be mentioned in the Liturgy,² still he did not forget to assert the rights of the Eastern Church to some lands unjustly appropriated by the Church of Rome. The Pope was told that as peace of old was restored to the Churches, so also ought the former boundaries of the dioceses of both the Churches to be restored just as they were before the division of Churches took place. For this reason the Churches on the Islands of Rhodes, Corfu, and others, unjustly appropriated by the Church of Rome, were to be returned

¹ Syr. x. 15, 16. Ducas, the Byzantine historian, though inclined towards the Latins, still notices very justly that Mark is *κατὰν καὶ σὺν τῇ ἀπαρέκτατος*, c. xxxi. p. 119.

² Syr. x. 12.

to the Constantinopolitan throne. Besides this, the Emperor, at the petition of the Metropolitans of Monemvasia, Rhodes, Mitylene, and several others, showed the Pope the necessity of recalling the Latin Bishops from these dioceses. "The Church of Rome," said the Metropolitans, "must enforce the holy laws, which prohibit two Bishops to preside in one diocese, and also the ordination of any Bishop in a diocese not under the jurisdiction of the Bishop ordaining."

The Pope made no answer to this demand of the Emperor. With regard to the recalling of the Latin Bishops from the Greek dioceses, he answered: "Whereas now, after the restoration of peace in the Church, there is no more disagreement between the Latin and Greek Bishops,—it would be unjust to dismiss either the Greek or the Latin Bishops from dioceses now under their jurisdiction, but it were better to leave matters as they are. Let two Bishops sit on one throne, but when the Latin dies, then let the Greek Bishop alone rule the diocese, and his successors be chosen by the Eastern Church. In the same manner, if the Greek Bishop dies before the Latin, then let the survivor alone sit on the throne, which from that time will be reckoned as being under the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome."¹ Such a decision of course could not satisfy the just demands of the Greek Bishops, and was besides a dangerous one for the Eastern Church. "The Pope's decision, however," says Syropulus, "was only a verbal one, and was never followed out."

From all the events subsequent to the union of Churches, one could well conclude as to the results it

¹ Syr. x. 14.

would have for the future. The Emperor sought and adhered to the union, simply in hopes of the aid promised for his unfortunate empire.

On the 6th of July Pope Eugenius was recognised by the Greeks at the Council of Florence as head of the Church: whereas ten days previous (June 25) the Council of Basle having repeated the ancient decree on the superiority of Œcumenical Councils over the Pope, had passed judgment upon Eugenius as a heretic for not agreeing to the truth of this decree, and had de-throned him. The Greeks left the Pope to manage as best he could with this Council and the other Pope elected at Basle. Isidore alone, with a few others, remained in Florence until (Sept. 4) Eugenius had publicly in the Cathedral hurled his anathemas and interdictions at the Council of Basle.¹ On the 18th of December, the Pope elected Isidore and Bessarion to the rank of Cardinals, as a reward for their zeal in the cause of the union. Besides this honour Isidore was named Legate a latere in Poland, Livonia, and Russia.²

The rest of the Greeks had already left the Council in the month of July. Those who had gone away the earliest, were obliged to wait for the Emperor in Venice, as he left Florence in the end of August (26th).³ Mark of Ephesus accompanied him, and his comforts were attended to by the Emperor himself during the whole of his journey.⁴ The Pope blessed the Em-

¹ Ant. Biblioth. vi. § 44.

² The Papal *γράφμα* to Isidore, republished in t. i. of the Hist. Russiæ Monumenta. No. 121.

³ Syn. Flor. p. 676; Syr. x. 17; Ant. Bibl. vi. § 44.

⁴ Syr. xi. 2.

peror, and promised to send out a fleet and army to Constantinople, if only the European monarchs would agree to help him. Three Cardinals and many prelates accompanied the Emperor as far as the frontiers of Tuscany. The Emperor arrived in Venice with his suite on the 6th of September.

Before the Emperor's arrival, Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Cyzicum, while celebrating the Liturgy in one of the Venetian monasteries, dared to mention the Pope's name in the service, but was then at the time reproved by the other Metropolitans and the Despot, who were present. The Emperor wishing to accede to the Doge's wish of seeing the Greek service, could prevail on the Metropolitan of Heraclea alone to officiate in the Church of S. Mark, and that too after many entreaties. The Metropolitan consented at last, but performed the service on the Greek antimensia, and with the Greek communion plate; the Pope's name was not mentioned and the Creed was read without the *Filioque* clause.¹

The Emperor left Venice on the 19th of October with his brother, the Bishops, and other Greeks, in two merchant vessels. The orthodox inhabitants of Corfu, Methone in the Peloponnesus, Eubœa, places where there were both Latin and Greek Bishops, on hearing the results of the Council from the Greeks, made no ceremony in showing their discontent with the union. "Until now," said they to the Greeks, "we could defend our faith and customs against the Latins, but now we must silently obey them in everything." The poor travellers, who had been away two years from their homes, arrived in Constantinople on the 1st of February,

¹ Syr. xi. 1—4.

1440. As an addition to their sorrow, the Emperor and the Despot on returning to their respective homes and families, found themselves widowers.¹

CHAPTER IX.

RETURN OF THE GREEKS HOME. REJECTION OF THE FLORENTINE UNION BY THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH.

As soon as the travellers stepped on shore, the inhabitants of Constantinople assailed the Bishops with questions: "How did the Council end? Have we gained the victory?" Those, who had been forced to the union, or had joined it from interested motives, but had not as yet lost all conscience of their crime, did not conceal the truth. Feeling themselves now at liberty in their native land, amidst their orthodox brethren, they answered with heartfelt sorrow: "We have sold our faith, we have exchanged Orthodoxy for heterodoxy, and losing our former pure faith have become azymites. May our hands, which signed the unjust decree be cut off! May our tongues which have spoken consent with the Latins be plucked out!"² These were the first words of the good but weak Pastors—Anthony of Heraclea, the oldest members of the Council, and others. Such news made a terrible impression on the orthodox townspeople. Every one avoided the new arrivers, and those who had anything to do with them. The clergy

¹ Syr. xi. 5—10.

² Ducas. c. xxxi. p. 120, 121. Ed. 1649.

who had remained in Constantinople would not even agree to officiate with those, who, repenting of their consent to the union, declared that they were forced to it !¹

The Emperor, who had never felt a real inclination to act in the cause of the Latins, and now dissatisfied with the Pope, grieving about the loss of his wife, and troubled by the public discontent with the union,² would not for a long time occupy himself with Church affairs. Three months had elapsed since the return of the Greeks. and the Church of Constantinople had still no Patriarch. At last the Emperor ordered the proper persons to think about the election of the Patriarch, an election the more necessary, as the disorders among the clergy were every day getting more and more violent. Then arose the question, "whom to elect?" Was the Patriarch to be chosen from out of those, who had shown the most zeal in the cause of the union, or from out of the defenders of Orthodoxy? The election of the Patriarch was to settle the lot of the union proclaimed in Florence. The Emperor, though little inclined to favour the Latins, would not however break his alliance with Rome. This was the reason of his not choosing Bessarion or any other zealot in the cause of the union, but demanded at the same time that the person chosen should be an upholder of the union.

The proposal of the Patriarchal throne was first made to Mark of Ephesus, the firm defender of Orthodoxy, and on his refusal of this dignity, as must have been

¹ Syr. xii. 1 ; Coll. Cruci. Turco-Græcia. l. i.

² For in many Churches the Emperor's name was even omitted from the service. Syr. xii. 2.

expected, three candidates were then chosen from out of those, who had been at the Council and signed the act of union; namely, Anthony of Heraclea, Dorotheus of Trebizond, and Metrophanes of Cyzicus. But Anthony and Dorotheus, as they rejected the union, so also did they reject the proffered honour. Anthony addressing the Council, said: "I have come here not to be elected, but to disburden my conscience before the Council, a thing I stand in need of very much. I, as you yourselves know, did not agree with those, who approved of the union, but I did sign the decree, though involuntarily. And since then has my conscience constantly smitten me. Bowed down with remorse, I have been seeking an opportunity of throwing this weight off my soul. I thank God, that He has spared me to see you all together in the assembly, and that now I can free myself of my burden by telling you all I wished to say. I repeat therefore, that I reject the union, that I find the Florentine decree contrary to the ancient tradition of the Holy Catholic Church, and give myself over to be judged by the Church, as guilty of having signed that which ought not to have been signed."

After this, Metrophanes was chosen, who at the desire of the royal officers gave a written promise of upholding the Florentine union. He ascended the Patriarchal throne on the 4th of May, 1440.

Though the promise given by Metrophanes was made in secret,—though even at that time there was no mention made of publishing the decree of the Florentine Council, or of inserting the Pope's name in the service,—still the very election itself of Metrophanes, who had shown himself a traitor in Venice by his servile adula-

tion before the Pope; the uncereemonious bearing towards him of the bishop present at his ordination as the Papal representative; then, again, the disappointment of the general expectation, that the new Patriarch would put affairs into their former order; all this together served to alienate most of the orthodox from the Patriarch. Many of the bishops would not officiate together with him; and when the Emperor tried to compel them to do so, Mark of Ephesus and Anthony of Heraclea secretly left Constantinople¹ (May 14.)

After this, the Emperor began to act with still greater care, especially when his brother Demetrius, who had not received the Florentine union, availing himself of the coolness of the people to the Emperor for favouring the Latin Church, openly opposed him; so that the Pope accused John of weakness and indifference to the cause of the union,² and Metrophanes positively threatened to leave his throne.

At the Emperor's persuasion, however, remaining where he was, he began to act in favour of the union, appointing his friends to the vacant dioceses; and when Demetrius again made friends with the Emperor, he urgently demanded a complete union with the Church of Rome, by right of the decree passed in Florence. But at the time when the Bishops were assembling in Constantinople, to discuss the means of bringing the

¹ Syr. xii. 2, 5. Compare with chap. ii. Among the works of Mark is one entitled, *De Fugâ meâ*. Fabr. xi. p. 675.

² In a letter to Constantine, another brother of the Emperor, of whom the Pope had received more favourable accounts from his Bishop in Constantinople, the Pope wrote: "*In eâ causâ (unione) per carissimum in Christo filium nostrum Johannem Palæologum Romanorum Imperatorem hactenus satis tenue et tepide est processum.*"

plans to pass, Metrophanes died.¹ (Aug. 1, 1443.) The Patriarch's death seemed to justify the severe sentence which had been pronounced over his actions in Jerusalem by the other three Patriarchs.

The Eastern Patriarchs already knew of the different Latin plans for gaining over the Greeks, from a letter written by Joseph, the Patriarch of Constantinople, either in Florence or Ferrara. After being informed by the Pope of the termination of the various discussions, they soon received an invitation from him to join the union of Churches agreed to at Florence, in which he carefully concealed the conditions under which the union took place. The Patriarchs came to know of these conditions from those who had returned from Italy. Burning with zeal for Orthodoxy, notwithstanding its persecution by the Turks, one of these pastors of the East answered the Pope, saying, that he was ready to enter into union with the Church of Rome, if that Church receives all ancient decrees of the Œcumenical Councils, and the doctrines confirmed by them and the Holy Fathers. "On this condition," he wrote, "we receive the Council of Florence, and do not refuse to mention the Pope's name in the service. In case of the contrary, we reject the Council; we sentence the bishops and clergy who receive it to be degraded from their rank, and the laymen to be excommunicated." Not satisfied with this, the same Eastern Patriarch wrote to the Emperor John:² "If you have given way

¹ Syr. xii. 11.

² This letter is written in December of the 6th indict, which corresponds to the year 1442. The Patriarch's name is not mentioned in the epistle, which is found in Allat. de consen. pp. 942—945.

to the Latins for a time only, in hopes of receiving their aid for the empire, and do now reject their doctrine and return to the orthodox faith of your royal ancestors, then we will pray for the salvation of the empire, and especially for thy soul, that the LORD may pardon you all your sins. But if you will be obstinate, and defend a doctrine strange to our Church, then not only will we leave off remembering you in our prayers, but will sentence you to a strict epitimia, in order that the disease of the strange and dangerous doctrine should not circulate further in CHRIST's Church. We cannot rule the Orthodox Church as hirelings; but for CHRIST's and His Gospel's sake we are ready to lay down our souls, bodies, blood, all that we have here on earth."

A few months afterwards all the three Eastern Patriarchs assembled in Jerusalem; and having been informed by Arsenius, Metropolitan of Cæsarea, of the Metropolitans and Bishops ordained by Metrophanes from among the Latins, pronounced judgment over the unworthy pastors, and proclaimed them deprived of all Church dignities till a Council should have examined their orthodoxy. Giving full powers to Arsenius for acting conformably with their decision throughout the whole of the East, the Patriarchs—Philotheus of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch, and Joachim of Jerusalem—wrote in their patriarchal letter: "The Metropolitan of Cæsarea of Cappadocia has informed us of the disorders occasioned by the lawless Council of Florence in Constantinople; a Council in which the Greeks received the Latin dogmas contrary to the ancient canons of the Orthodox Church. The same

Metropolitan informed us, that Metrophanes of Cyzicum, who hath unlawfully usurped the Constantinopolitan chair, doth distribute dioceses in the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate and in all the East to his associates, who corrupt their fold by their false doctrine, and sow temptations in CHRIST'S Church. Wherefore we, in the name of the vivifying and inseparable TRINITY, do through this Council declare to all Metropolitans, Bishops, and others of the clergy ordained by Metrophanes, that they, for partaking of this heresy, are deprived of their right of officiating, of all their ecclesiastical degrees, until their faith shall be examined by the Œcumenical Council. Should they not obey our decree, and voluntarily leave their places, which they occupy unlawfully, let them then be excommunicated by the Holy and Consubstantial TRINITY, both they, and those who think together with them." Giving the Metropolitan of Cæsarea the right of carrying out this decree, the Patriarchs also gave him full powers to preach publicly against the unjust union, to expose and correct all the heterodox thinkers. The decree was published in April, 1443.¹

Mark of Ephesus, the aged defender of Orthodoxy, weighed down by age and illness, but strong in spirit, was not silent also. In his circulars to all Christians, he conjured them to depart from the Florentine union, as one offensive to GOD; vividly representing the admixture of the old with the new, of the orthodox and patristical with what was newly invented by the Latinizing Greeks, and offered his own confession of faith, founded

¹ In the same indict as the preceding one. It is found in Allat. de consensu, pp. 939—941.

on the pure doctrine of the Church.¹ "These people," he wrote, "admit with the Latins that the HOLY GHOST proceeds from the SON, and derives His existence from Him; for so says their definition, and at the same time they say with us that the SPIRIT proceeds from the FATHER. With the Latins, they think the addition made to the Creed lawful and just; and with us will not pronounce it. With them they say that azymes are the Body of CHRIST, and with us dare not communicate on them. Is not this sufficient to show that they came to the Latin Council, not to investigate the truth, which they once possessed and then betrayed, but simply to earn some gold, and attain a false and not a true union? False: for they read two creeds, as they did before; perform two different liturgies, one on leavened, the other on unleavened bread; two baptisms, one by the trine immersion, and the other by aspersion—one with the holy chrism, the other without it. In like manner all other customs are different with them, e. g., fasts, church rites, &c. What sort of union is this, then, when it has no external sign? How could they join together, retaining each his own? Many

¹ We know of the (a) circular epistle of Mark, in which he states his opinion of the Council of Florence. It is published with the objections written by Joseph of Metho in the Acts of the Council of Florence, t. ii. pp. 274, 361. (b.) Another epistle, with the same contents, published together with the objection written by Gregory the Protosyncellus, pp. 362, 475. (c.) The confession of Mark of Ephesus, first prepared by him to be presented to the Council of Florence, and then published in a more enlarged form. It is preserved in Greek in manuscripts. Objections were also written against it by Gregory; they only prove that Mark's words were very dangerous for his opponents. Conf. Fabr. Bibl. Græc. Ed. Harles. xi. p. 393, 673, et seq.

were tempted by the idea," Mark continued, "that one can find a medium between two doctrines. True: one can find such expressions which, having a double meaning, could at the same time express something between the two doctrines. But a doctrine midway between two contrary doctrines on the same subject is impossible; for in this case it must be something between truth and falsehood, between an affirmation and a negation. Thus, if the Latin doctrine of the SPIRIT'S procession from the SON is just, then ours is false. What middle doctrine can there be here?" In the end of his epistle Mark wrote, "Avoid, brethren, such teachers, and all communion with them. They are false apostles, workers of evil transformed into Apostles of CHRIST. . . . It is not the LORD JESUS they serve, but their own bellies, and seduce the hearts of the innocent by their sweet words and blessings. You know what the Apostles command us to do: 'Though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.' (Gal. i. 8.) And CHRIST'S beloved disciple says, 'If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.' (2 S. John 10, 11.) Keep, then, to the traditions received by you, both those which are written and not written, so as not to lose your own security by giving way to evil doctrines."¹

Mark's words and influence had a great effect both on the ignorant and plain, and on the learned, inclining them to the defence of Orthodoxy. So George

¹ Synod. Flor. t. ii. p. 369, et seq.

Scholarius, who for a time inclined towards the Latins, was now confirmed by Mark in the true faith, and afterwards became one of its most zealous defenders.¹ Without Mark of Ephesus, none of those, who had rejected the union would enter into any disputes with their opponents.² Following Mark's example, his brother John Eugenicus wrote a refutation of the Florentine decree;³ Syropulus put all the actions of the Council in their true light; in like manner Amirutius represented, though briefly, the secret motives of the Greeks for inclining to the union with the Church of Rome.⁴ Another philosopher, Gemistes Pletho, who had defended the orthodox doctrine at the Council, also published a defence of the orthodox doctrine on the procession of the HOLY GHOST.⁵

Thus, we see, that from all sides voices were raised against the Florentine union. The Emperor however retained the same relations to the Orthodox and the Church of Rome. Brooding on his favourite idea of throwing off the Turkish yoke, he had already entered into negotiations with the Pope and Vladislaus, the

¹ A letter is preserved from Mark to George Scholarius, in which he reproves him for his unnecessary readiness to admit the reconciliation of Churches. See Fabr. Bibl. Græc. Ed. Harles, t. xi. pp. 364, 365. The same is testified by Manuel the Rhetorician in his work on "Mark of Ephesus, and the Florentine Council." Manuscript of the Synod. Library, n. 396.

² See the words of the Chartophylax Michael Balsamon in his report to the Emperor John Palæologus. Allat. de cons. p. 924.

³ Published by Dositheus, Patr. of Jerusalem, *ἐν Τόμῳ καταλλαγῆς*.

⁴ Extracts from his epistle to Demetrius, Duke of Nauplia, in Allat. de consens. p. 882, and other places.

⁵ Fabr. Bibl. Græc. Ed. Harles, t. xii. p. 100. Extracts are published by Allat. de consens. p. 908, and other places.

King of Hungary, concerning the mutual concentration of forces against the Ottoman Empire. Their plans had been to cause a revolt against Amurath in Asia Minor, and by alluring him there with the best part of his forces, to cut off his return to Europe by means of a powerful fleet, and then retake all the towns in his European dominions. The Pope had already invited the European Monarchs to aid the unfortunate Greeks. Cardinal Cæsarini persuaded Vladislaus to break a treaty of peace concluded by him a year ago with Amurath for the space of ten years. The fleet arrived in the Hellespont. But Amurath managed to return from Asia, and even to rout Vladislaus' army under Varna (Nov. 10, 1444.) Vladislaus himself and Cardinal Cæsarini fell in this battle.¹ So vanished all the hopes placed in the union, which God had not blessed!

But even after this, John still could not make up his mind to break all his relations with the Pope. For about three years the Church of Constantinople had no Patriarch after the death of Metrophanes, and the vacant see was given to *Gregory Mamma*, the Emperor's confessor, and one of the most active causes of the Florentine union. He himself wrote objections to Mark's writings,² and began a dispute in Constantinople between the principal defenders of Orthodoxy and the Latin litterati.³ The Pope named him for his zeal in

¹ Le beau Livr. 118, § 5—16.

² Gregory's objections were mentioned above. Besides this Gregory sent a defence of the Latin doctrine to the Emperor of Trebizond; *Orthod. Græc.* t. 1, p. 419, 468, and asked Bessarion to write some objections to Mark's syllogisms against the Latin doctrines. *Fabr.* xi. p. 394.

³ The controversy of Mark of Ephesus and George Scholarius with Bartholomew, Bishop of Corone, is well known. It is mentioned by

the Latin cause, Patriarch also of the Latin party then in Constantinople.¹ But notwithstanding all his efforts, as the Pope himself writes, he could not proclaim and enact the decree passed in Florence.² So strong was the aversion of the clergy and people to the Latin union, which was attained at the sacrifice of Orthodoxy! The Bishops and clergy of Constantinople demanded, that an Œcumenical Council should be held in Constantinople itself to terminate all the evil caused by the adherents of the union.³ But the Emperor John died (Oct. 31, 1448) before he had time to satisfy these de-

Anthony the Florentine in his manuscript of the year 1445. See Zoernikoff, p. 1042. The results of this dispute were two books of Scholarius "on the procession of the HOLY GHOST." Both were originally written for the Emperor of Trebizond. The first was published in Greek in London, 1624, though under another name: *Σύνταγμα, περιγραφόμενον Ὁρθοδόξου καταβύγιον*. The other is preserved in manuscript. See Fabr. Bibl. Græc. xi. 384, et seq. 392. Le Quien, Dissert. Damasac. i. p. 30. On Bartholomew, Bishop of Corone, see Le Quien, Or. Chr. t. iii. p. 900 et 1040.

¹ Le Quien, Or. Chr. t. iii. p. 835. So Pope Pius II. writes, giving Isidore, the once Russian Metropolitan, the title of Patriarch of Constantinople (in 1459) after Gregory's death.

² Pope Nicholas V. wrote in 1451 to the Emperor Constantine Palæologus: Et ecce jam tot anni transiere, ex quo ista facta sunt, et tamen apud Græcos *unionis* hujusmodi *decretum silentio tegitur*, nec ulla spes elucet ut violetur, qui ad hanc unionem amplectendam dispositi esse videantur. Zoernikoff, p. 1046.

³ See the reports (*ἀναφορά*) of the Bishops and clergy of Constantinople printed in the book of Nestorius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, on the Papal authority, in Jassæ, 1682, pp. 233, 236. The time of this report can be determined by the following circumstances: (a.) the opinion of the Eastern Patriarchs about the union was already known; (b.) Constantinople had its own Patriarch, whom the Bishops and clergy wished to prove his Orthodoxy. This might have been either during the latter period of Metrophanes' administration or else in the time of Gregory.

mands; at all events before his death he rejected all union with the Church of Rome.¹ At last the innermost wishes of the orthodox pastors and people were fulfilled. A year and a half after Constantine's accession to the throne of Byzantium, three Eastern Patriarchs in whose name, though without their consent, the Florentine unorthodox "decree" was signed, viz., Philotheus of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch and Theophanes of Jerusalem, assembled in Constantinople with many Metropolitans and Bishops to quiet the disturbed Church. Assembling a Council in the Church of S. Sophia in Constantinople, they deprived Gregory Mamma of his patriarchal throne and appointed the Orthodox Athanasius in his place, and then in the name of all the Eastern Church rejected the decree of the Council of Florence which they convicted as having acted contrary to the orthodox faith, and accused the Church of Rome of many digressions from the ancient rules and rites of

¹ As a proof of this we can adduce,—besides the testimony brought forward by Zoernikoff from the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, 1450 and 1451, (Zoernikoff, p. 1044),—the very words of *George Scholarius* (adv. the addition to the Creed), quoted by the Patriarch Dosithius, in his history of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, (Book 10, pt. 1, c. 18, § 9): "With regard to this John, we know very well, how he reasoned about his affairs in Florence, and how attentive he was to our answers; how he forced no one, and wished us to preserve the doctrine of the Fathers; approved of those who did this and despised all who thought contrary. We are all witnesses of this; every one of us has heard this from his own lips. At the beginning though, he, fearing when there was no cause to fear,—would not allow the public performance of this act so saving for the soul." (p. 932.) Manuel the Rhetor plainly attributes the return of John Palæologus to Orthodoxy to the persuasion of Mark of Ephesus: τοὺς μὲν ἐπανάκτησάμενος, καὶ αὐτὸν εἶπα τὸν ἀλλότμον Βασιλέα. Cod. Mo. Synod. Bibl. sec. catal. Mathæi. n. 393, p. 119.

the Church Œcumenical.¹ Gregory soon after this left as a fugitive for Rome (August, 1451.)

One could have hoped that now peace would have been quite reinstated in the Constantinopolitan Church.

¹ Allatius is the first to give information of the acts of this Council in the addition to his book : *de Ecclesiæ Orientalis et Occidentalis perpetua consensione*, pp. 1380, 1389. Allatius doubted the validity of this Council, finding some anachronisms and contradictions in its acts, with contemporary history. Afterwards the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheus, published the acts of this Council in his work : *Τόμος ἀγάπης*, in a more corrected form, and in his History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem refuted the objections of Allatius. (T. ii. book 10, ch. ix. pp. 915—917.) In the same way Zoernikoff, not knowing of a more correct copy of these acts, also tried to solve Allatius' objections. (T. ii. pp. 1052—1058). The misunderstandings are not all cleared up, and very likely the reason of this is, that the original copy of these acts, as is said in its title page, is taken not from the church codex, but from a private library of Constantine Lascares, most likely in a shorter and not quite correct form. This helps to explain why at the Council Macarius of Nicomedia calls the Metropolitan of Kieff Dorotheus, whereas Jonah was then Metropolitan of Kieff and All Russia. Here we will only notice, that (a.) the Eastern Patriarchs in the *γράμμα* given to the Metropolitan Arsenius in April, 1443, had remanded the examination of the Orthodoxy of the Bishops ordained by Metrophanes until the time of the Œcumenical Council (*ἔχρησεν ἂν ἐξετασθῇ ἡ εὐσέβεια κοινῶς τε καὶ οἰκουμενικῶς*); (b.) that the Bishops and clergy of Constantinople in their report (*ἀναφορά*) to the Emperor also showed the necessity of calling the Eastern Patriarchs to a Council in Constantinople, and promised to write to them, (*Νεκταρίου*, p. 235); (c.) that Amirutius writes, that the Eastern Patriarchs present at the Council rejected the signatures of their vicars (*Οἱ Πατριάρχαι τὰς ὑπογραφὰς τῶν οἰκείων ἐπιτρόπων εὐλόγως καὶ συνοδικῶς ἠθέτησαν*. Allat. de cons. Eccl. p. 682.) We know of no other Council in which this was done, but the Council of Constantinople, 1450 and 1451. (d.) That though the name of the Patriarch Athanasius, elected in place of Gregory, is not mentioned in the contemporary Byzantine manuscripts, still we do often meet with a name like his, viz., Anastasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the Russian narrative of the fall of Constantinople. (Nicon's Manuscr. t. v.)

But Constantine wishing to save his throne, to defend which he had hardly five thousand soldiers of his own, again turned for aid to the Pope, and by this caused new disorder in the Church, which terminated with the fall of the very Empire. The new Commander of the Turks,—the harsh and ambitious Mahomet II., immediately on his accession to the throne, (Feb. 5th, 1451)—commenced planning the conquest of Constantinople. Constantine was struck with terror on hearing this, and sent off an embassy to Rome petitioning help, promising to fulfil the Florentine treaty, and even inviting Gregory to return to Constantinople.

When this became known, the defenders of Orthodoxy were sorely taken aback. George Scholarius then stood at their head (he was called Gennadius on receiving tonsure). Mark had already passed into eternity, and before his death had bequeathed to his friend the keeping of the ancient Orthodoxy.¹ Gennadius, who then lived in the monastery of the *All-possessing God*, when preaching a sermon during the Emperor's visit to the monastery, tried to dissuade him from an union with the Church of Rome, which in fact was hardly of

¹ Gennadius pronounced a panegyric over the body of this venerable father (Fabr. xi. p. 392), and Mark's brother, John Eugenicius, composed a *service* for the anniversary of his death (ibid. p. 653). Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, according to the testimony of one aged monk, says, that in Constantinople the anniversary of Mark's death was annually celebrated by the family of Eugenici, from which Mark descended. *περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς*. p. 186. Mark's *last will* to Scholarius is published by Renaudot, together with the Homilies of Scholarius on the Eucharist. *The life of Mark of Ephesus*, composed by his brother John, is mentioned in the Montfaucon manuscripts. Bibl. Bibliothecarum, p. 778.

any use to Constantine.¹ Eugenius' successor, Pope Nicholas V., sent to Constantinople, not an army and fleet, but only his Cardinal, Isidore, the ex-Metropolitan of Russia (Nov. 1452). A very short time passed in negotiations with him ; but few consented to the union ; only three Bishops and some of the Clergy received it ; even the Emperor was not sincere in accepting it.² The greater part of the Clergy, and especially the Monks, positively refused to take part in any negotiations with an apostate Greek.

Nevertheless, on the 12th of December, 1452, the spiritual and civil authorities assembled in the Church of S. Sophia. Cardinal Isidore read the act of union, (the first time after its proclamation in Florence,) and in token of the reconciliation of Churches, solemnly officiated in the Liturgy together with the Greek and Latin Clergy, in which the names of Pope Nicholas and the ex-Patriarch Gregory were mentioned. But many persons present at the service would not even take the antidoron from the officiating clergy.

In the meantime, while this ceremony was going on in the Church of S. Sophia, crowds of the Orthodox made their way to the monastery in which Gennadius Scholarius was, asking him how they were to act. Gennadius shut himself up in his cell, on the doors of which were written the prophetic words : " Pitiab!e Greeks ! why do you still err, and throwing away all hope on God, seek aid of the Franks ? Why do you, with the whole of the town, which will soon fall, lose your Orthodoxy ? Be merciful to me, O God ! I tes-

¹ Fabr. xi. p. 358, 383.

² As Ducas, a partizan of the Church of Rome, writes, p. 142.

tify before Thee, that I am innocent of this crime. You see, miserable ones, what is doing around you, and at the time captivity is approaching you,—reject the faith of your fathers and receive unrighteousness! I shall never reject thee, beloved Orthodoxy; and will not conceal thee, O holy tradition, while my spirit dwells in this my body.”¹

The inspired words of this monk roused the minds of the people. The clergy and laity cursed the union and all its present and future upholders. Everywhere cries resounded: “We want no aid from the Latins, we want no union, we will not receive the service of the azymites.”² The Orthodox Clergymen sentenced all who had communed with the Unionists to bear Church punishment. The great Church was quite empty, for the Orthodox would not visit it; Gennadius circulated pamphlets among the people full of enmity against the Latins, and exhortations to those of the union to cleanse their consciences from sin by strict penitence.³

The mental disorder of the inhabitants conduced a good deal to the success of Mahomet’s arms. The besieged inhabitants, instead of concentrating their remaining forces in the defence of the town, continued their religious animosity to each other. The Orthodox and Latins were constantly anathematizing each other. At last Constantinople was taken by Mahomet (May 29th, 1453).

¹ This exhortation is contained in Ducas’ History, p. 142, and in manuscript among the works of Gennadius, Fabr. Bibl. Gr. t. xi. p. 259. Both agree with each in the principal points. We quote the words of both.

² Ducas, cap. 36.

³ Ducas, cap. 37. On the works of Gennadius belonging to this time, see Renaudot, Fabr. Bibl. Græc. pp. 358, 359.

The Sultan left the Greek Faith untouched, and appointed as head of the captive Christians the same Gennadius, who had done so much for Orthodoxy even in the last disorderly times. He and his successors were good and strictly Orthodox Pastors of the overburdened, but as yet not fallen Greek Church. In the fallen Empire, the Church of the East presents to us a beautiful example of a nation steadfastly preserving the pure doctrine of its fathers, and of faith preserving the nation whole during the space of four heavy centuries. Like the Jews in the Babylonian captivity, the Greeks, on falling into the hands of the Turks, became still more strongly and firmly attached to their old faith; deprived of political liberty, and many worldly advantages inseparable from it, they found their sole consolation in their Orthodox Church. The Popes, by allowing the capital of Eastern Christianity to perish, only increased the animosity of the Greeks towards Romanism.

The Church of Russia showed herself a worthy daughter of the Orthodox Eastern Church, in her relations to the Florentine union.

With the title of Apostolic Legate to all northern countries, Isidore, at the close of the Council, returned from Italy to Russia, in hopes of alluring her to an union with the Church of Rome. From the capital of Hungary, he sent off circulars to the Dioceses of Lithuania, Russia, and Livonia, then under his jurisdiction; informing the Christians of the Latin and Greek Faith about the union which had taken place between the Western and Eastern Christians. Isidore wrote: "You, good Christians of the Constantinopolitan Church, receive this union with spiritual joy and honour.

I pray you not to dissent in anything from the Christians of Rome. And you Latin tribes, do not avoid the Greeks, avowed by Rome to be true Christians; pray in their churches, as they will also pray in yours. Confess your sins to Priests of both sides: from any one of them receive the Body of CHRIST alike holy in leavened or unleavened bread. So the Council, held in Florence, bids you do."

In the Russian territories, subjected to the influence of Latin heterodox power, Isidore could sooner meet with persons inclined to receive the union, than in autocratic Russia. But even in the former places his zeal met with an obstacle in the circumstance that Casimir, Grand Duke of Lithuania, had declared not for Pope Eugenius, but for the Council of Basle and Pope Felix elected by it.¹ In Volhynia Isidore ordained Daniel as Bishop, who had agreed to the union, and then tried to defend the Latinizing Clergy from the hatred the Orthodox felt towards them, by means of his γράμματα.² In Kieff Duke Alexander gave a gramma to Isidore, as to "his father, the Metropolitan," over all his dukedom. The Kieff manuscripts affirm, nevertheless, that Isidore was expelled from Kieff.³

In the spring of 1441, Isidore came to Moscow, bearing a very polite letter from the Pope to the Grand Duke. The clergy and laity impatiently awaited the

¹ Weissenberg, die Grossen kirchenversaml. 15 und 16 Jahrhundert. xi. b. s. 434.

² On Daniel, see History of the Russian Empire, t. v., 311; and the Historical Acts, published by the Archaeological Committee, t. i. n. 52.

³ The gramma of the 5th of Feb. 1441, is printed in the Historical Acts, t. i. n. 259.

Metropolitan in the Cathedral of the Assumption. Isidore came surrounded by a number of nobles, preceded by the Latin Cross. Relying on the simplicity and ignorance of his fold, he acted in a more decisive manner than his brethren in Constantinople. During the first Liturgy, the Pope's name was mentioned, and at the end of the service Isidore's Archdeacon read the Florentine decree from the ambo. All these news, as yet unheard of in the Russian Church, astonished both the clergy and laity very much. No one knew what to think of what was seen and heard. But the Grand Duke Basil Basilievitch, burning with zeal for the pure doctrine of the Church, solemnly, in the very Church, exposed the apostate Isidore, called him a false pastor, a corrupter of souls, a heretic, and at last ordered the unworthy Metropolitan to be led down from his throne; and, confining him in the Tchudoff Monastery, assembled a Council of Bishops and the higher grades of the Clergy to examine the decree of the Florentine Council. When it was found to be contrary to the ancient Orthodox doctrine, and when Arsenius, the companion of Isidore, had explained the way matters had been conducted in Florence, then the Grand Duke ordered efforts to be made to incline Isidore to repentance. But all was in vain. Remaining in confinement the whole of the summer, the pseudo-Metropolitan fled in the autumn from Moscow to Tver, very likely in hopes of meeting with a better reception there, as the Duke of Tver had sent off one of his boyars with him to the Council. But even in Tver he was received no better. The Grand Duke of Tver arrested him. Isidore managed however to escape, and fled to

Novgorodok of Lithuania, and then to Rome, with the bad news of the frustration of the Papal plans. Thus, the Council of Florence, instead of reconciling the Church of Great Russia with Rome, or causing her to depart from Orthodoxy, only offered this Church an opportunity of showing her aversion from Romanism.

CHAPTER X.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE COUNCIL.

After having shown from the report of the Eastern Bishops and the Council of Constantinople what view the Orthodox Church had of the lawless Council of Florence, it is now unnecessary to make any further remarks to justify this view. It will be quite sufficient to take a short view of what was done at the Council, and how it was done. From the Acts of this Council, and the circumstances preceding and following it, we see very plainly that the motives which impelled the principal agents in the Council did not breathe of God's Spirit; that it was not those principles that served as a foundation for the union, which the Spirit of God requires; not those means were employed to strengthen the union of the Church which agree with religion and the fear of God. Consequently the enterprise was shattered, as an enterprise of man, not blessed by JESUS CHRIST, the Head of the Church, therein justifying the saying of old: "*If this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to nought.*" (Acts v. 38.)

Looking over the circumstances which preceded the Florentine Council, and had paved the way to it, we see from the very first glance that it was no sincere, holy desire of the peace in the Church; but strange, worldly motives, which impelled the Emperor and Pope to undertake the reinstatement of the ancient peace between the Latins and Greeks. The Emperor had hoped by means of this union to obtain help from the head of the Christian West against the Turks, who had hardly left him anything but the walls of Constantinople. The Pope, on the other hand, proposing to the Emperor to assemble a Council in Italy, was far from wishing that the causes of disagreement between the Churches should undergo lawful investigation by a Council. This was only the wish of the Greeks, to which, as he says himself, he acceded from condescension.

But even when allowing the discussions and disputes on the dogmas of faith to take place in the Council, he did not at all mean to agree with the Greeks, should they even prove the justness of their doctrine. He negotiated with them, in hopes of getting the Eastern Church into his own hands. He convened a Council in Ferrara, simply with the object of opposing it to that of Basle. By inviting the Greeks he gave the Council an appearance of being an Œcumenical one, and thereby deprived the opposition Council of this title; for two Œcumenical Councils could not be held at one and the same time. And how much cunning was resorted to by both parties, in consequence of the different views nourished by them! The Pope, to execute his plans, avails himself of a consent forced from the weaker party in the Council of Basle. The Papal

legate assures the Greeks that the Council of Basle is reconciled to the Pope. On the arrival of vessels from the Council of Basle, the Papal legate and the legate from Basle try to overreach one another in gaining over the Greeks by the most tempting promises. At the same time, among the Greeks also, means were taken to ensure success at the Council following, agreeably with the Emperor's views. Wishing to give the Council the appearance of being an Œcumenical one, the Emperor takes with him to Italy the vicars of the Eastern Patriarchs, but himself tells them whom to choose, demands credentials not too strict for them, and then, conformably to his own views, more than once changes their appointments. Can a work, begun with such motives, and executed by such means, be blessed and sanctified by the grace of the HOLY GHOST?

Then commence the acts of this Council, first transacted in private, and afterwards solemn sessions. The Greeks prove the error of the Latin doctrine on purgatory, the injustice of the addition to the Creed, and the doctrine contained in it. They adduce the plainest words from Holy Scripture, the testimonies of the Œcumenical Councils, and the Fathers of the Church, to prove their words. They refute the Latin arguments, expose the interpolations made in the testimonies of the Fathers adduced by the Latins; and all in vain. The Latins dispute against what is self-evident, and induce the Greeks to agree to what has been anathematised by the Œcumenical Councils. Does not this evince an endeavour to make the one, holy, Catholic Church to contradict her own self?

The public disputes are finished. John Palæologus

gives in to his stubborn opponent; favourers of the union appear; and the opinion refuted by the Greeks is put as its corner-stone. What efforts must have been made, what cunning applied to found an unsure peace on so weak a foundation! The Greeks are pinched in their means of subsistence, which the Pope had taken on his own hands; the Emperor is loaded with promises, which no one thought of fulfilling or even could fulfil; various formulas are devised, so that the disputed doctrine might be satisfactorily expressed for both parties; forged testimonies of the Fathers are adduced; at one time votes are allowed to be given, and at another, the very same persons are deprived of this right; the Greeks opposing the union are persuaded by means of promises, rewards, or derision; the Latins do not begrudge their money. At last, by means of different falsehoods, the Latins apparently attain a superiority over the Greeks, with the help of three traitors to Orthodoxy.¹ Is such a Council to have the right of calling itself Œcumenical? Were affairs ever so conducted and such decrees made in Œcumenical Councils? Can such a Council give its decrees the force of the words of the HOLY GHOST, like true Œcumenical Councils? If the Œcumenical dignity of this Council is wished to be founded on the circumstance, that there were present at it the repre-

¹ Here we might well mention the opinion of a learned Latin, a person "near to Pope Eugenius, namely, *Ambrosius Traversari*. He writes: While in Florence I was obliged to hear and see things done, which could not but make an impression on me, who had been ever used to quite other things. To say truth, I more willingly spend my time with the peasants of our monastery, than with the pillars of the earth, and even with the Pope of Rome." xi. s. 423, 424.

sentatives of the five ancient patriarchal sees ; we must not forget also, that during the Patriarch's lifetime, three Vicars of the three Patriarchal sees did not agree to the union, and only two of the five gave their vote in its favour. After Joseph's death no one was commissioned to vote in the name of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch ; the apostate of Antioch met a firm opponent and witness of the truth in Mark of Ephesus. Thus, even in appearance, there was never any actual agreement of all the patriarchal sees to the union with the Church of Rome. But even Mark's voice alone, is sufficient to prove that the Canons of the Florentine Council are not Œcumenical ones : for Mark spoke in defence not of his own private opinion, which might have been erroneous, but had on his side the testimonies of Œcumenical Councils.

The enterprise unlawfully begun nearly broke down in Florence. The obstinacy of both parties when disputing about the authority and rights of the Pope, nearly deprived Eugenius of the first success, which had cost him so dear. At the time of the very union the reconciled parties shunned each other ; mutual coolness and distrust divided them as before. On returning to Constantinople the Bishops did not conceal their aversion from the supposed Church union. The Emperor John, during the remaining years of his reign, did not care to proclaim the act of the union to the people, notwithstanding that two Patriarchs of Constantinople favoured the union. Electing such Patriarchs, he apparently kept up the union with the Church of Rome, having his political views for doing so, but at the same time he would not introduce the union into his own

empire. The Orthodox would not even listen to it. Mark of Ephesus and his party exposed its unlawfulness. The Eastern Patriarchs pronounced judgment against the union first in Jerusalem, and then in Constantinople. The miserable effort of the last Emperor of Constantinople to proclaim the union in his city was no act of the Church, and was put down by God.

Thus, the union of Churches proclaimed in Florence was, (a) undertaken without the Greeks being persuaded of the justice of the Latin doctrine; (b) was unlawfully brought to pass; and (c) very lawfully rejected.

PUBLISHED BY JOSEPH MASTERS,

ALDERSGATE STREET AND NEW BOND STREET.

HISTORY OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH. General Introduction. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. Two vols. 22s.

"Treats of the Geography, Ecclesiology, Liturgies, Calendar, &c. There is much of interest to the general reader, and the author's well established reputation is guarantee that there is no lack of learned research."—*Ecclesiastic*.

"We must express our admiration of the research and indefatigable industry of the author, and our high sense of the addition he has made to our theological literature in this very learned publication."—*English Review*.

APPENDIX TO THE INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH; containing a List of the Sees. 1s.

THE HISTORY OF THE PATRIARCHATE OF ALEXANDRIA.

By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. Two vols. 24s.

Contains its history and foundation from its apostolic founder, through the annals of its earlier patriarchs—The Persecutions and Martyrs—The Sabellian, Arian, and Nestorian Heresies, up to the time of Mahomet—Its Medieval History and its Decline—The great gulf between East and West up to the present time, when it is a shadow of its former self, "persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed."

DOCUMENTS CONNECTED WITH THE PRESENT STATE AND MISSIONS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH. Translated with Notes by the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. 5s.

CONTENTS: Catholic Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism; Letter to a Converted Protestant, on Purgatory, and the State of the Dead; Letter to the Abbé Bautain, on the Great Men of the Russian Church; Letter to a Roman Convert; Comparison of the Consecration of Bishops in the East and West; Russian Missions, &c.

Eight Essays are by M. A. N. Mouravieff, author of the "History of the Russian Church;" the Ninth by Innocent, late Archbishop of Odessa; and the Tenth is by an Athenian Priest.

PRIVATE DEVOTIONS as enjoined by the Holy Eastern Church for the use of her Members. Translated from the original. 1s.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH, being the Primer or Spelling Book, the Shorter and Longer Catechisms, and a Treatise on the Duty of a Parish Priest. Translated from the Slavonic-Russian by the Rev. R. W. BLACKMORE, late Chaplain to the Russian Company in Cronstadt; Rector of Donhead S. Mary, Wilts. 8s.

The purpose of this volume is to set before the reader the Doctrine of the Russian Church, in that form in which it is actually inculcated upon children, lay people, and clergy, from Baptism to Ordination.

HARMONY OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINES WITH THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF THE EAST. By the Rev. R. W. BLACKMORE, M.A. 3s.

These notices and extracts have been put together with the view of showing that Anglican Divinity is not necessarily irreconcilable with that of the Eastern Catholics, and it is hoped that the reader will find no point omitted on which any well-informed member of either communion would be likely to suspect disagreement.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF RUSSIA. By A. N. MOURAVIEFF. Translated by the Rev. R. W. BLACKMORE, M.A. 10s. 6d.

"Mouravieff gives a clear, succinct, and regular account of the events which marked the introduction and progress of Christianity in his native country; he notices every material incident, places it in its due light, and affords it that attention and space its importance demands."—*Preface*.

PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION. Chiefly for the use of the Clergy. Translated from Coptic, Armenian, and other Eastern Rituals. By the Rev. S. C. MALAN, M.A., Vicar of Broadwindsor. 1s. 6d.; limp antique calf, 3s. 6d.

MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY WEDNESDAY AND FRIDAY IN LENT, ON A PRAYER OF S. EPHRAEM THE SYRIAN. Translated from the Russian. To which are added, Short Homilies for Passion Week, from S. Chrysostom, S. Severian, and S. Ephraem. By the Rev. S. C. MALAN. 3s. 6d.

London: JOSEPH MASTERS, Aldersgate Street, and New Bond Street.

Theological & Scholastic Works,

PUBLISHED BY

J. MASTERS, 33, ALDERSGATE STREET,
AND 78, NEW BOND STREET.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

ATKINS.—THREE ESSAYS, ON THE ETERNAL SONSHIP OF CHRIST; THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST THE THRONE OF DAVID; THE RESURRECTION. By the Rev. Walter B. Atkins, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin, late Perpetual Curate of S. Mary Magdalene, Harlow. 3s. 6d.

BADGER.—THE NESTORIANS AND THEIR RITUALS. By the Rev. G. P. Badger, M.A., East Indian Chaplain at Aden. Two vols. With numerous Illustrations and maps. 36s.

"A valuable contribution to our knowledge of the East. The second volume is of deep interest to the theological student, and the religious public generally."—*Morning Post*.

"The whole account is very interesting—but that which will make his work essential to the Oriental historian is the fact that he was resident at Mosul during the horrid massacre of the Nestorians by the Emir of Jezzerah: more valuable still are the translations of the Offices. No liturgical library can possibly dispense with this book."—*Morning Chronicle*.

"The author has not only travelled, but laboured among the Eastern Christians, and has judiciously divided the information he had to impart."—*John Bull*.

"Contains a great mass of the most valuable information."—*English Review*.

BLACKMORE.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH. being the Primer or Spelling Book, the Shorter and Longer Catechisms, and a Treatise on the Duty of a Parish Priest. Translated from the Slavonic-Russian by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, late Chaplain to the Russian Company in Cronstadt; Rector of Donhead S. Mary, Wilts. 8s.

The purpose of this volume is to set before the reader the Doctrine of the Russian Church, in that form in which it is actually inculcated upon children, lay people, and clergy, from Baptism to Ordination.

BLACKMORE.—HARMONY OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINES WITH THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF THE EAST. 3s.

These notices and extracts have been put together with the view of showing that Anglican Divinity is not necessarily irreconcilable with that of the Eastern Catholics, and it is hoped that the reader will find no point omitted on which any well-informed member of either communion would be likely to suspect disagreement.

PART I.

B

1

Theological and Scholastic Works.

BLACKMORE.—HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF RUSSIA. By A. N. Mouravieff. Translated by the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, M.A. 10s. 6d.

Mouravieff gives a clear, succinct, and regular account of the events which marked the introduction and progress of Christianity in his native country; he notices every material incident, places it in its due light, and affords it that attention and space its importance demands.—*Preface.*

BRECHIN.—THEOLOGICAL DEFENCE FOR THE RIGHT REV. ALEXANDER PENROSE FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin, on a Presentment by the Rev. W. Henderson and others, on certain Points concerning the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. 6s.

BRITTON.—HOMÆ SACRAMENTALES. The Sacramental Articles of the Church of England vindicated from recent misrepresentations, and illustrated by the Writings of the Compilers and last Editor, and by other Documents published under the sanction of the Church between the years 1536 and 1571. By the Rev. T. H. Britton, M.A., late Pusey and Ellerton Hebrew Scholar, Oxford. 8vo., 6s.

"A very elaborate and learned work, detailing the sentiments of the Reformers in opposition to the sentiments of Mr. Gorham."—*English Review.*

"We commend the treatise of Mr. Britton to the attentive study of all to whom the baptismal question appears enveloped in doubt, uncertainty or ambiguity; and especially to the Clergy and to Candidates for Holy Orders, whom it behoves not only to have clear and settled views on the subject, but to be able to explain and defend them by conclusive arguments."—*John Bull.*

"I thank you for the valuable book which you have given me and the Church."—*Bishop of Exeter at his Visitation at S. Peter's, Tiverton, April 26th, 1851.*

CARTER.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewer. Post 8vo., 4s.

"A book containing a great deal in a short space, and putting forward in plain words, and with a clear reference to broad principles, and to the testimony of both the Primitive Church and Holy Scripture—a doctrine which unhappily needs to be well stated at the present moment. The special merits are, first, its depth, and then as a consequence of this, the power with which it brings home to its readers the consequences involved in the popular and shallow views on the subject."—*Guardian.*

"Thoroughly discusses its subject, meets common objections, and places the Doctrine on a right and firm basis."—*Clerical Journal.*

CHAMBERS.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, AS EXPOUNDED BY HERBERT THORNDIKE, D.D. With Notes (being a digested series of Authorities up to the year 1720, on the points raised in Archdeacon Denison's case), and a Preface by J. D. Chambers, M.A., Recorder of New Sarum. 2s. 6d.

"The body of notes has a permanent and technical importance. So skilfully is the Catena set out that it becomes a conspectus of Anglican Doctrine on the subject."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

COMPER.—THE DISTINCTIVE TEACHING OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES STATED AND MAINTAINED IN A SERIES OF LECTURES. By the Rev. John Comper, M.A., Incumbent of Nairn, N.B. 12mo., cloth, 4s. 6d.

DENISON.—SARAVIA ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST. The Original Latin from a MS. in the British Museum hitherto unpublished. The Translation by the Archdeacon of Taunton. Demy 8vo., 7s. 6d.

"We may be thankful for any cause which has brought before the world a work so curious and interesting. It contains very high and Catholic language on the Eucharist: the translation is managed with ability and scholarship."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

DENISON.—THE DEFENCE OF THE ARCHDEACON OF TAUNTON, IN ITS COMPLETE FORM; including all the Evidence which was either not admitted by, or was tended before, the Court. Royal 8vo., 10s.

"Necessary to form a full judgment of the whole proceeding."—*Clerical Journal*.

DENISON.—PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ARCHDEACON OF TAUNTON IN 1854, 1855, 1856. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

DUKE.—SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS OF BISHOP BUTLER'S ANALOGY. By the Rev. Henry H. Duke, M.A., Vicar of Westbury, Wilts. 3s. 6d., interleaved 5s.

"Carefully and ably done. No work in our language needs the aid of an interpreter more than Butler's most masterly treatise, or better repays any amount of labour that may be bestowed upon it."—*Ecclesiastic*.

DICKINSON.—LIST OF OLD SERVICE BOOKS ACCORDING TO THE USES OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH, WITH THE POSSESSORS. By F. H. Dickinson, Esq., M.A. 3s. 6d.

ECCLESIASTIC: a Magazine relating to the affairs of the Church, Education, &c. This Magazine is now published in Monthly Parts at 1s. each. 20 vols. bound, £9. Sent free by post for 12s. per annum, paid in advance.

These volumes form as it were a library of Theology. They contain articles and reviews on every important topic and work of the day as they affect the Church—whether doctrinal, practical, parochial, devotional, or controversial—and the rule on which the magazine is conducted is that of setting forth the distinctive principles of the Church boldly and uncompromisingly.

"The Church of England has a very able champion in this periodical, which is conducted with judgment and learning."—*Morning Chronicle*.

FLOWER.—THE THREE BOOKS OF THEOPHILUS TO AUTOLYCUS ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Translated, with Notes, by the Rev. W. B. Flower, B.A., of Magdalene College, Cambridge, English Chaplain at Baden Baden. 3s. 6d.

Theological and Scholastic Works.

FOX.—THE CHURCH IN THE CLOISTERS; or Monks and Monasteries. Being a History of the Monastic system in England and the various Orders. By the Rev. Samuel Fox, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Morley, Derbyshire. 5s.

CONTENTS:—Origin of Monachism.—Eastern Monks.—Orders in Britain.—S. Patrick.—Anglo-Saxon Monks.—S. Cuthbert.—Ven. Bede.—The Discipline.—Officers.—Buildings.—Schools.—Military Orders.—Its Gradual Decay in England, &c.

HEYGATE.—CATHOLIC ANTIDOTES. By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, M.A., author of "Care of the Soul," "Evening of Life," "Ember Hours," &c. Post 8vo., 5s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—On the Prevalence of Error and the Appeal to Antiquity, Chap. I.—On the Inspiration of the Divine Scriptures.—Chap. II. Baptism, a Witness to Original Sin.—Chap. III. Original Sin in Relation to the supposed Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.—Chap. IV. The Eucharist and the Atonement.—Chap. V. The Penal Due of Sin.—Chap. VI. The Eucharist and the Incarnation.—Chap. VII. Predestination Guarded.

"Must have cost considerable labour; it is a real boon to the Church, as the subject to which it directs attention is of the greatest importance. Any man does good service who insists on the appeal to antiquity. Mr. Heygate discusses at length, and as we think successfully, the objection that antiquity if resorted to, leads men to Rome."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

"We have read it with deep interest, and to our mind, it has supplied not only matter for interesting thought, but for solving some painful questions which the present day brings forward."—*Clerical Journal*.

HEYGATE.—EMBER HOURS. For the use of his younger brethren, the Deacons and Priests of the Church of England. 3s. in cloth antique.

CONTENTS:—Chapter I. Study.—II. Detail with persons.—III. Detail with things.—IV. Tone.—V. Scrutiny.—VI. Perseverance.—Appendix.

"This manual will prove both seasonable and serviceable, and many will derive valuable guidance and instruction in their vocation."—*Clerical Journal*.

"A full manual of hints to the clergy, and a real and practical guide to the ministry. That such books are among us and of us is a sign of good, but that such principles are at work, and that they must be influential is more than a sign."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

IRONS.—BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. The Judgments of the Church Court of Arches, and the State Court of Privy Council, in parallel pages; also, the Opinions of the present English and Scottish Bishops; with Appendices, containing, Opinion of the Irish Church, a Bishop's right to examine Clergy, and Note on the Rev. W. Goode's Letter; to which is prefixed, a Discourse on Heresy and Open Questions. By the Rev. W. J. Irons, D.D., Vicar of Brompton. Demy 8vo., 3s. 6d.

"Indispensable to all who desire to have even the most moderate collection of authentic documents connected with this memorable controversy."—*English Churchman*.

"Readers are here in one small volume presented with the means of making themselves acquainted with the incidents of a question which becomes hourly of more ominous importance."—*Morning Post*.

IRONS.—ON THE WHOLE DOCTRINE OF FINAL CAUSES. A Dissertation in Three Parts, with an Introductory Chapter on the Character of Modern Deism. Demy 8vo., price 7s. 6d.

JEBB.—SIX LETTERS ON THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH, advocating the claims of the Church of England, and deprecating Secessions to Rome. By the Rev. John Jebb, A.M., Rector of Peterstow. 1s.

LAST WORDS OF AN ENGLISH CATHOLIC. A Record of Inner Life. Fcap. 8vo., 5s.

"For my brethren and companions' sake I long to trace out as I comprehend now, the glorious change which He designs should be in all effected, by the gradual transformation of the human being, fallen, but regenerate, into the heavenly likeness of the perfect man."—*Preface.*

MALAN.—LETTERS TO A YOUNG MISSIONARY. By the Rev. S. C. Malan, M.A., Vicar of Broadwindsor. 1s. 6d.

"Not only valuable in themselves, but under existing circumstances more particularly in connection with certain popular cries, point to what is the want of Indian Missions—that of learned missionaries."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

MANDLEY.—TRACTARIANISM (so called by the prejudiced and misinformed) NO NOVELTY; as exemplified in the Confession of the Faith and Practice of a Church of England man, of the ever memorable epoch, 1688. Edited by G. F. Mandley, Merchant. 6s.

MORMONS (The). The Dream and the Reality; or, Leaves from the Book of Experience of one who left England to join the Mormons in the City of Zion, and awoke to a consciousness of their heinous wickedness and foul abominations. Edited by a Clergyman. 1s. 6d.; paper cover, 1s.

MURRAY.—A CATENA OF AUTHORITIES WITH REGARD TO THE ALTAR AND EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By the Rev. F. H. Murray, M.A., Rector of Chislehurst. 1s. 6d.

"This is a good collection of opinions on an important subject from the early Fathers down to John Wesley. We thank Mr. Murray for the means thus afforded us of forming an opinion."—*Clerical Journal.*

"Adds another valuable publication to the list of authorities in favour of a Doctrine of the Church."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

NEALE.—HISTORY OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH. General Introduction. By the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A. Two vols., £2.

"Treats of the Geography, Ecclesiology, Liturgies, Calendar, &c. There is much of interest to the general reader, and the author's well established reputation is guarantee that there is no lack of learned research."—*Ecclesiastic.*

"We must express our admiration of the research and indefatigable industry of the author, and our high sense of the addition he has made to our theological literature in this very learned publication."—*English Review.*

Theological and Scholastic Works.

NEALE.—THE HISTORY OF THE PATRIARCHATE OF ALEXANDRIA. Two vols., 24s.

Contains its history and foundation from its apostolic founder, through the annals of its earlier patriarchs—The Persecutions and Martyrs—The Sabellian, Arian, and Nestorian Heresies, up to the time of Mahomet—Its Medieval History and its Decline—The great gulf between East and West up to the present time, when it is a shadow of its former self, "persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed."

NEALE.—APPENDIX TO THE INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH; containing a List of the Sees. 1s.

NEALE.—MEDIÆVAL PREACHERS AND MEDIÆVAL PREACHING. A Series of Extracts, translated from the Sermons of the Middle Ages, chronologically arranged. With Notes, and an Introduction. 8vo., 7s.

NEALE.—DOCUMENTS CONNECTED WITH THE PRESENT STATE AND MISSIONS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH. Translated with Notes by the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A. 5s.

CONTENTS: Catholic Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism; Letter to a Converted Protestant, on Purgatory, and the State of the Dead; Letter to the Abbé Bautain, on the Great Men of the Russian Church; Letter to a Roman Convert; Comparison of the Consecration of Bishops in the East and West; Russian Missions, &c.

Eight Essays are by M. A. N. Mouravieff, author of the History of the Russian Church; the ninth by Innocent, late Archbishop of Odessa; and the Tenth is by an Athenian Priest.

OWEN.—AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By the Rev. Robert Owen, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Oxford. 12s.

"A very learned and impartial work; and is evidently the result of immense reading. It is a volume of which the University of Oxford may well be proud, —not being a mere collection of quotations taken at second hand, but a condensation of the whole body of Patristic Divines reduced with great skill into a system of Theology."—*Oxford Herald*.

"English Theology owes much to Mr. Owen for this valuable work. It is admirably calculated to introduce young students at once to a wide and most interesting range of topics. The learning, moderation, and candour of the writer are conspicuous in every page."—*Literary Churchman*.

"A readable, and in many respects, a fair, candid, and temperate volume."—*North British Review*.

OXLEE.—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY AND INCARNATION CONSIDERED AND MAINTAINED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF JUDAISM. By the late Rev. John Oxlee, M.A., Rector of Molesworth, Hunts. Three Vols. £1. 1s.

Vol. I. (1815.) On the Holy Trinity.

Vol. II. (1820.) The Doctrine of the Incarnation.

Vol. III. (1850.) The Doctrine of the Incarnation as to our LORD's office and work.

OXLEE.—THREE SERMONS. 6s.

Published at three different times, on the Power, Origin, and Succession of the Christian Hierarchy in the English Church, with copious and historical notes and indexes. These sermons bear on the subject of Absolution and the Apostolical Succession, and supply valuable information on subjects in agitation at the present day.

OXLEE.—THREE LETTERS TO MR. C. WELLBELOVED, (1824)
Tutor of the Unitarian College, New York, occasioned by his Attack on the Charge of Archdeacon Wrangham.
—Strictures on Separation from the Church.—The Athanasian Creed, &c. 2s. 6d.

OXLEE.—THREE LETTERS, (1825), ADDRESSED TO THE REV. FREDERICK NOLAN, Vicar of Pritlewell, on his Erroneous Criticisms and Misstatements in the *Christian Remembrancer*, relative to the Text of the Heavenly Witnesses, &c. 3s. 6d.

OXLEE.—THREE LETTERS (1842) HUMBL Y ADDRESS ED TO THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, on the Inexpediency and Futility of any attempt to Convert the Jews to the Christian Faith in the way and manner hitherto practised, being a General Discussion of the whole Jewish Question. 3s.

OXLEE.—THREE MORE LETTERS (1845) in continuation of the same subject. 3s.

OXLEE.—THE MYSTERIOUS STRANGER; or, Dialogues on Doctrine.—Dialogue I. between the Jew Rabbi and the Stranger. By the late Rev. John Oxlee. Edited by his Son, the Rev. John Oxlee, Perpetual Curate of Oversilton, Diocese of York. 1s.

PALMER.—DISSERTATIONS ON SOME SUBJECTS RELATING TO THE "ORTHODOX" COMMUNION. By the Rev. W. Palmer, M.A. 10s. 6d.

"Cannot be otherwise than welcome to the theological student. We hail with satisfaction the appearance of this volume, which abounds with interesting data on the subject."—*John Bull*.

"The latest and perhaps the ablest treatise on the subject. Mr. Palmer's intimate acquaintance with Russia as well as with Greece and Constantinople, gives him a grasp of his subject which renders him always instructive."—*English Churchman*.

"The masterly way in which every point is handled leaves nothing to be supplied."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

"Mr. Palmer enters learnedly and at length into the various particulars, endeavouring to discover in each some misapprehensions that might be removed if both parties would approach each other in a friendly and fraternal spirit."—*Guardian*.

Theological and Scholastic Works.

PRESBYTERIAN CLERGYMAN LOOKING FOR THE CHURCH. (Abridged.) 12mo., cloth, 3s.; cheap edit. 2s.

"Written by one born and nurtured in the bosom of Presbyterianism, who came in due time, by the blessing of God, to see the Church most clearly identified by doctrine and usage with that built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets."—*Preface*.

REVELATION (THE) OF JESUS CHRIST, Explained agreeably to the analogy of Holy Scripture. By a Clergyman. 14s.

"It must be confessed that he has sought the key in the only place in which it can be found, in the Holy Scriptures, in a proper spirit, and by a proper light."—*Morning Post*.

RUSSELL.—THE JUDGMENT OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH (Posterior to the Reformation) ON THE SUFFICIENCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, &c. By the Rev. J. F. Russell, B.C.L., Incumbent of S. Mary's, Greenhithe. 10s. 6d.

SHIPLEY.—THE PURGATORY OF PRISONERS: or, an Intermediate Stage between the Prison and the Public. By the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. 3s. 6d.

"Performed in a very creditable manner."—*Clerical Journal*.

"For ability and benevolence commends itself to every social reformer and philanthropist. The style is original, clear, and pungent."—*John Bull*.

SPELMAN.—HISTORY AND FATE OF SACRILEGE. By Sir Henry Spelman, Knight. New edition, Demy 8vo., cloth, 10s. 6d.

"Reflects high credit on all parties concerned."—*English Churchman*.

"It is full of learning, and bears everywhere the stamp of an author thoroughly in earnest. It is throughout an appeal to facts as testimony to the fixed principles of a sort of Divine Jurisprudence. Sir Henry Spelman appeals throughout to the law of God against the fearful wrongs which the Church has undergone."—*Ecclesiastic*.

SPIRIT OF THE CHURCH (The). A Selection of Articles from the *Ecclesiastic*. Post 8vo., 7s. 6d.

A new Contents has been printed, which may be had gratis, containing a List of the Books on which the articles are written.

"Most gladly would we see it in the hands of everyone now preparing for Holy Orders; and most firmly do we believe that if it were by them truthfully and carefully studied, it would do more to fit them for a wise and devoted discharge of their several duties than any work we know suited to this age."—*Oxford Herald*.

"As a collection of illustrative essays they have high value. The aim of the series is entirely practical—they illustrate principles, and show the Sacramental theory of the Church at work."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

"Contains many valuable papers, and in all of them much practical information is given. We do not know a volume in which so much that is peculiarly important to clergymen is presented in a condensed form."—*Clerical Journal*.

"Whether viewed as a manual of Ecclesiastical History and precedent, an analytical record of clerical ceremonies, or an expositor of and aid to pastoral duty, we think the appearance of this work will be hailed gratefully."—*John Bull*.

WILKINS.—THREESCORE YEARS AND TEN. By George Wilkins, D.D., Archdeacon of Nottingham. Dedicated to the Bishop of Lincoln. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—Advanced Age; Uncertain Extent of Life; The Septuagenarian; Past Scenes of Life; Country Churchyard and Epitaphs; Heathen Elysium; Hades; Primitive Christianity; Scotch Churches; Cathedrals; The Faithful Christian.

"A pleasant, indeed affecting, memorial of a good man's sunset time."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

WHYTEHEAD.—COLLEGE LIFE. Letters to an Undergraduate. By the late Rev. Thomas Whytehead, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Chaplain to the Bishop of New Zealand. 12mo., cloth, 2s. 6d. New edition, Edited by the Rev. W. Griffin, M.A., Vicar of Ospringe, Kent.

CONTENTS:—I. Origin and End of the Collegiate System.—II. College Discipline.—III. College Rooms.—IV. College Chapel.—V. The Hall.—VI. The Lecture Room.—VII. The Library.—VIII. College Friends.

"A great deal of wisdom and much sincere piety in these letters."—*Clerical Journal*.

"It is no slight service to put forth for the members of these noble Institutions right notions as to their spirit and principles, and to enable them to see how under the existing system they may be carried out into action in every department of the Collegiate life."—*Ecclesiastic*.

THEOLOGICAL PAMPHLETS.

ALDRICH.—CHURCH RATES AND THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM.

A Pamphlet dedicated to His Grace the Duke of Marlborough. With References to the Minutes of Evidence brought before the House of Commons in 1851, and the House of Lords in 1859. By the Rev. John Cobbold Aldrich, M.A., Incumbent of St. Lawrence, Ipswich. 1s.

BARTER.—A FEW WORDS ON THE PROGRESS OF INFIDELITY IN LONDON DURING THE SPRING OF 1857. By the late Rev. W. B. Barter, M.A., Oriel College, Oxford. 1s.

BARTER.—A FEW WORDS ON THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO THE PROMISED LAND, AND ON THE MILLENNIUM. ½d.

BARTER.—THE GAINSAYING OF CORE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. Addressed to all who call upon the Name of JESUS CHRIST our LORD. Second edition. 6d.

BLUNT.—ECCLESIASTICAL RESTORATION AND REFORM. No. I. Suggestions on Church Rates, Parish Officers, &c. No. II. The Education Question Practically Considered. By the Rev. W. Blunt, M.A. 1s. each.

CONFESSION, AN EARNEST EXHORTATION TO.
Fcap. 8vo. 4d.

CHAMBERLAIN.—IN WHAT SENSE MAY THE HOLY EUCHARIST BE CALLED THE LORD'S SUPPER? A Letter to the Bishop of S. Andrew's, &c. By the Rev. T. Chamberlain, M.A. 3d.

DENISON CASE (The):—

PAPER DELIVERED INTO THE REGISTRY OF THE DIOCESE OF BATH AND WELLS, Sept. 30, 1856, by G. A. Denison, Clerk, M.A., Vicar of East Brent, and Archdeacon of Taunton. To which is prefixed, THE DECLARATION OF THE COURT, Aug. 12, 1856, as filed by the Court. Royal 4to., 1s. A Cheap Edition, for distribution, Demy 8vo., 2d. each, or 10s. per 100.

CONSIDERATIONS UPON THE OPINION OF THE COURT AT BATH, and the Exposition of Articles XXVIII. and XXIX. therein set forth. By the Rev. C. S. Grueber. 2nd edit., 1s.

A LETTER TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, with Statements and Documents relating to the Trial of the Archdeacon of Taunton. By the Rev. C. S. Grueber. 3rd edit., 1s.

A SECOND LETTER TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, being an Exposure of the Rev. W. Goode's book. By the Rev. C. S. Grueber. 2s. 6d.

A LETTER TO THE RIGHT HON. STEPHEN LUSHINGTON, Legal Assessor to His Grace the Abp. of Canterbury in the Trial of the Ven. the Archdeacon of Taunton. By the Rev. C. S. Grueber. 4d.

A REJOINDER TO THE REPLY OF THE REV. A. N. BULL. By the Rev. C. S. Grueber. 4d.

ARTICLE XXIX. AND ARTICLE XXVIII. clause 3, considered in reference to the Three Sermons of the Archdeacon of Taunton, with additional matter and references to S. Augustine and other Fathers. By the Rev. C. S. Grueber. 7th edit. 3d. on a broad sheet, or in demy 8vo., 6d.

EIGHTEEN FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE COMMISSION AT CLEVEDON AND THE COURT AT BATH, in the case of Ditcher v. Denison, collected from Published Documents. 4d.

DENISON.—WHY SHOULD THE BISHOPS CONTINUE TO SIT IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS? 1s.

DENISON.—THE NATIONAL SOCIETY. A Letter to the Rev. Canon Wordsworth, and to the schoolmasters of the Church of England. With Appendix. 1s.

DESPREZ.—BABYLON THE GREAT, NEITHER ROME PAGAN, NOR PAPAL, BUT JERUSALEM. By the Rev. P. S. Desprez, B.D. 8d.

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC. 1s.

FLOWER.—NON-EPISCOPAL ORDERS. A Letter. By the Rev. W. B. Flower, B.A. 2s. 6d.

FLOWER.—ON THE CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS. A Letter. Price 6d.

FOWLE.—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS THE EPISTLE OF S. PAUL. By the Rev. W. H. Fowle, M.A., Curate of Almondsbury. 1s. 6d.

FRASER.—THE CONVOCATIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. With an Appendix. By the Rev. W. Fraser, B.C.L., Vicar of Alton, Staffordshire. 1s.

GRUEBER.—HOLY BAPTISM: a complete Statement of the Church's Doctrine. By the Rev. C. S. Grueber, B.A. 1s. 6d.

GRUEBER.—PLAIN DISCOURSE ON THE ONE FAITH. 1s.

HUMBLE.—A LETTER TO THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF S. ANDREW'S, &c., on the occasion of His Lordship's recent Charge to his Clergy. With an Appendix. By the Rev. Henry Humble, M.A., Canon and Precentor of S. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth. 2s. 6d.

INGLE.—RITUAL BEAUTY NO MARK OF ROMANISM. By the Rev. John Ingle, M.A. 6d.

LEE.—AN ADDRESS TO THE CHURCHMEN OF ENGLAND ON THE INCREASE IN THE EPISCOPATE. By the Rev. A. T. Lee, M.A., Rector of Ahoghill, Ireland. 6d.

DR. LUSHINGTON'S JUDGMENT UPON "ORNAMENTS OF THE CHURCH," Considered by a Parish Priest. 2nd edition. 6d.

MC COLL.—A LETTER TO THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, on the case of Mr. Cheyne, and the Bishop of Brechin. By the Rev. Malcolm Mc Coll. 6d.

Theological and Scholastic Works.

- MILNER.**—FEW WORDS ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. By the Rev. J. Milner, B.A. 6d.
- NEALE.**—THE TWENTY-NINTH CANON, AND REASONS FOR ITS ABROGATION. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. By the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A., Warden of Sackville College. Demy 8vo. 6d.
- RAINE.**—THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS, and the Duties of English Churchmen in that respect. By Rosa Raine, author of "Rosa's Summer Wanderings," "Floreat Ecclesia," &c. 1s.
- RUSSELL.**—ANGLICAN ORDINATION VALID. A Refutation of certain Statements in "The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined, by the Very Reverend Peter Richard Kenrick, V. G." By the Rev. J. F. Russell, B.C.L. 1s.
- SAVING FAITH VIEWED IN REFERENCE TO THE VIEWS OF THE REV. R. AITKEN.** 3d.
- SCOTT.**—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION AND CANON LV. By the Rev. W. R. Scott, B.A., Perpetual Curate of S. Mary Magdalene, Harlow. 1s. 6d.
- SCOTTISH COMMUNION OFFICE** (A Letter on the). 4d.
- STEERE.**—AN HISTORICAL SKETCH OF ENGLISH BROTHERHOODS. By the Rev. Edward Steere, LL.D. 6d.
- WARD.**—DIVINE SERVICE. A Letter on the Alteration of the Prayer Book. By the Rev. W. P. Ward, M.A., Rector of Compton Valence. 1s.
- WATSON.**—THE PEOPLE, EDUCATION, AND THE CHURCH. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Exeter. By the Rev. A. Watson, M.A. 1s.
- WATSON.**—APOLOGY FOR THE PLAIN SENSE OF THE PRAYER BOOK ON HOLY BAPTISM. 2s.
- WESLEY.**—THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT AND SACRIFICE. From the Works of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., Vol. XXIII. p. 141, Bristol edition. Edited by the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A. Fcp. 8vo. 3d.
- WOODS.**—PREMONITION TO THE PRIESTHOOD TOUCHING THE USE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES AS AN ELEMENTARY BOOK. By the late Rev. R. Woods. 6d.
- WOODWARD.**—DEMONIACAL POSSESSION, ITS NATURE AND CESSATION. By the Rev. Thomas Woodward, M.A. 1s. 6d.



